

# Andrews University Seminary Student Journal

---

Volume 1  
Number 2 *Fall 2015*

Article 1

---

8-2015

## Full Issue

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/aussj>

---

### Recommended Citation

(2015) "Full Issue," *Andrews University Seminary Student Journal*: Vol. 1 : No. 2 , Article 1.  
Available at: <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/aussj/vol1/iss2/1>

This Full Issue is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Andrews University Seminary Student Journal by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact [repository@andrews.edu](mailto:repository@andrews.edu).

# ANDREWS UNIVERSITY SEMINARY STUDENT JOURNAL

---

Volume 1

Fall 2015

Number 2

---

## CONTENTS

**EDITORIAL** ..... iii

### INVITED ARTICLE

REEVE, JOHN W. Future Views of the Past:  
Models of the Development of the Early Church ..... 1

### ARTICLES

#### NEW TESTAMENT

DORNELES, VANDERLEI. The Eighth Empire: New Hypotheses  
for the Symbols of Revelation 17 ..... 17

#### THEOLOGY

WETTERLIN, CORY. Ellen G. White's Understanding of the  
Indwelling of the Holy Spirit: A Chronological Study ..... 35

ZIVADINOVIC, DOJCIN. Wesley and Charisma:  
An Analysis of John Wesley's View of Spiritual Gifts ..... 53

#### CHURCH HISTORY

KAISER, DENIS. Leo the Great on the Supremacy of the  
Bishop of Rome ..... 73

\*\*\*\*\*

Copyrights @ 2015 held by authors

Online edition: ISSN 2376-063X

Print edition: ISSN 2376-0621



## EDITORIAL

ADRIANI MILLI RODRIGUES

Editor, Andrews University Seminary Student Journal

This is the second issue of the Andrews University Seminary Student Journal (AUSSJ). In the editorial of the first issue, Dr. Moskala (Dean of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary at Andrews University) introduced AUSSJ by recording its birth and wishing a long life to this journal. The publication of the second issue attests that AUSSJ is alive and it intends to offer scholarly articles on a continual basis (bi-annually) in its steps toward maturity as an academic venue.

The sponsoring faculty member for the present issue is Dr. John Reeve, Assistant Professor of Church History and Co-editor of *Andrews University Seminary Studies*. In his invited article “Future Views of the Past: Models of the Development of the Early Church,” Reeve insightfully delineates eight models of historiography of the early church and highlights the complexity of a proper assessment of individuals and trends in the early church. This complexity comprises positive and negative aspects, instead of leading to a general evaluation that simply classifies an individual as “good” or “bad” theologian.

This volume includes an article by Dr. Vanderlei Dorneles, who is one of the editors of Brazil Publishing House (Casa Publicadora Brasileira) and was a visiting student at Andrews University at the time of his dissertation research in 2009-2010. Dorneles argues for a hypothesis for the interpretation of the symbols of Rev 17, which focuses on the eighth empire and compares Rev 17 with chapters 12 and 13.

The remaining three articles have been written by three doctoral candidates respectively: Cory Wetterlin explores “Ellen White’s Understanding of Indwelling of the Holy Spirit” in his chronological study of four passages written by her, namely, sections in *Steps to Christ*, *Special Testimonies to Ministers and Gospel Workers*, *Desire of Ages*, and *Testimonies for the Church*. Wetterlin concludes that White understands the indwelling of the Holy Spirit as an abiding in Christ through a devotional interpersonal relationship of faith.

Dojcin Zivadinovic provides an account of Wesley’s view of spiritual gifts. Zivadinovic argues that Wesley was not a cessationist, as far as the interpretation of spiritual gifts is concerned. On the other hand, Wesley also challenged strongly what he considered “fanatical” usage of spiritual gifts.

Finally, Denis Kaiser describes in “Leo the Great on the Supremacy of the Bishop of Rome” the rationale formulated by Pope Leo the Great to affirm the supremacy of the bishop of Rome. This rationale provided a theoretical framework for later papal claims regarding absolute power in ecclesiastical and secular realms.

I believe that the reader will take advantage of these scholarly contributions in the fields of church history, theology, and biblical studies.



## **FUTURE VIEWS OF THE PAST: MODELS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EARLY CHURCH**

JOHN W. REEVE  
Assistant Professor of Church History  
jreeve@andrews.edu

### *Abstract*

Models of historiography often drive the theological understanding of persons and periods in Christian history. This article evaluates eight different models of the early church period and then suggests a model that is appropriate for use in a Seventh-day Adventist Seminary. The first three models evaluated are general views of the early church by Irenaeus of Lyon, Walter Bauer and Martin Luther. Models four through eight are views found within Seventh-day Adventism, though some of them are not unique to Adventism. The ninth model, proposed by the author, is expressed colloquially for the sake of simplicity and memorability: The good guys are the bad guys/The bad guys are the good guys. The lessons of history must be learned from actual people with their successes and failures. There was no golden age when exemplars thought and acted in perfect virtue. History was lived by very human people.

Keywords: tradition, orthodoxy, heresy, model.

### *Introduction*

Religious training has always been a problematic area of humanities education, wishing to be, at the same time, both specific to the values and needs of a particular confession or movement as well as being objective and academic. This paper is directed toward establishing a model for understanding the development of Christianity in the early church for use within Seventh-day Adventist seminary training, but has implications for all teaching of the early church.

Ever since Martin Luther wrote his *Babylonian Captivity of the Church* Protestants have had a tendency to view the early church as having fallen away from the teachings of Jesus Christ in a great apostasy.<sup>1</sup> The Seventh-day Adventist church is no exception. The extent of knowledge many Adventists have of the early church, including many entering seminary, is derived from three short chapters in Ellen

<sup>1</sup>The full title is *A Prelude on the Babylonian Captivity of the Church*. It was written in 1520 and at [www.lutherdansk.dk/Web-Babylonian\\_Captivitate/Martin\\_Luther.htm](http://www.lutherdansk.dk/Web-Babylonian_Captivitate/Martin_Luther.htm) an English translation is available.

White's book *The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan* in which she both praises and condemns the leaders of the early church. On one hand, praise is offered for their devotion to Christ in the face of persecution, and on the other, they are condemned for their incorporation of pagan-style superstition and ritual in place of the simple forgiveness and worship of Christ.<sup>2</sup> Many Adventists take these chapters to mean that the early church was irretrievably corrupt and is, therefore, of no value to study other than to identify what went wrong in the great apostasy.

Whereas gaining insight into the great apostasy is understandable and necessary to a church trying to dodge the mistakes of the past, it is not a current concern of the larger academy of Christian historians. Quite frankly, the question has been out of vogue for nearly a century. Yet it is indeed one of the questions that our Seventh-day Adventist movement/church most definitely needs to address, especially if we are to further define what church is in our self-understanding. Hence, I shall proceed in attempting to bring together a model, or parts of a model that can help us understand not just what has been called the great apostasy, but the whole development of the early church, both the positives and the negatives.

### *Models 1 & 2: Irenaeus and Bauer*

Two major models of orthodoxy and heresy have dominated the twentieth-century scholarship on the development of the early Christian church. The first, articulated by Irenaeus of Lyon,<sup>3</sup> essentially assumed and re-articulated by most of the Christian writers throughout the early centuries. Irenaeus' model is caricatured by Walter Bauer in his classic 1934 book on *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, where he argues that there was originally a uniformity of belief among Christians that was only disrupted by heretics who arose with diverse views afterwards.<sup>4</sup> Bauer in his introduction rejects what he calls the "ecclesiastical position" on the development of heresy. His four points on that view can be summarized as follows:

1. Jesus revealed pure doctrine to his apostles both before and after his death.
2. After Jesus' final departure, the disciples apportion the world among themselves, and each takes the unadulterated gospel to his allotted portion.

<sup>2</sup>Ellen G. White. *The Great Controversy* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 1999), 39-78.

<sup>3</sup>Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, in *Ante-Nicene Fathers (ANF)*, vol. 1, American Edition, arranged by A. Cleveland Cox, reprint (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994), 315, 316, 359.

<sup>4</sup>Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, 2nd German ed., trans. and ed. by Robert A. Kraft, et al. (Mifflintown, PA: Sigler, 1996).

3. Even after the death of the disciples, the pure gospel branches out further. But the devil plants seeds of error in the divine wheat field; true Christians, blinded by Satan, abandon the pure doctrine. As Origen said: “All heretics are first believers; then later they swerve from the rule of faith.” (*Commentary on Song of Songs* 3, commenting on 2.2) The unspoken idea is that all heretics were first believers.
4. Right belief is invincible. In spite of all evil efforts to the contrary, orthodoxy prevails.<sup>5</sup>

This “uniformity to diversity and back to uniformity” model had a triumphal appeal to fourth- and fifth-century Christians who are very aware of their fights for orthodoxy and their assumptions of following a continuous tradition. In its place, Bauer suggests that the triumph of orthodoxy over heresy was the end of a struggle between various competing parties which mutually referred to themselves as the true Christians and the others as those with degenerate views. The winner, Roman Christianity, was enabled by its victory to declare itself orthodox and rewrite history in its own favor.<sup>6</sup> Thus, in Bauer’s model, orthodoxy is defined late fourth-century, and did not exist earlier, leaving very little connection between the Jesus movement and what developed into Christianity.

Whereas I think Bauer makes several good points and brings together an impressive amount of historical details, I must say that his major premise is not proved. He seems to push the evidence in his favor in two different directions. For North Africa, Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor, and Macedonia Bauer stresses the evidence which portrays the variety of Christianity, especially the prevalence of Marcionism, Gnosticism, Bardaisanism, and Montanism.<sup>7</sup> For Rome, however, he

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., xxiii, xxiv.

<sup>6</sup>See, for instance, *ibid.*, 112, 120, and 131.

<sup>7</sup>First, Marcionism is the label used to describe the beliefs of Marcion of Sinope about God. According to this figure of the second century, the God of the Hebrews were not the same as the God of Jesus and Christians. Irenaeus condemned this teaching and claimed that the Hebrew Scriptures are Christian. See B. Aland, “Marcion – Marcionism” in *Encyclopedia of Ancient Christianity*. Ed. Angelo Di Berardino, 3 vol. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2014), 2:676-678. Second, Gnosticism, similar to Marcionism, proposes the dualistic worldview that describes Jesus Christ as a lesser divine being sent by the Supreme God to bring humans esoteric knowledge (*gnosis*) in order to free their souls to heaven. See I. Ramelli, “Gnosis – Gnosticism” in *Encyclopedia of Ancient Christianity*, 2:139-147. Third, Bardaisanism is the somewhat Christian gnostic idea, originated with Bardesanes of Edessa in the second century, with strong influence of oriental astrology, combated by Hippolytus and St. Ephrem of Syria. See A. Camplani, “Bardesanes (Bardaisan) of Edessa” in *Encyclopedia of Ancient Christianity*, 1:327-330. Fourth, Montanism was a movement of the second century, also called the new prophecy, which originated with a so-called prophet, Montanus. Some of his companions, Prisca and Maximilla also claimed to have the gift of prophecy. They practice asceticism and believed in an intimate



downplays the variety and portrays a very stable, consistently orthodox, power-motivated Christianity. The early presence of diversity within Christianity seems incontrovertible, especially, unfortunately for Bauer, at Rome. This “diversity to uniformity” model has been adapted by many history of religions scholars to become, in its current form, the dominate model of the academy. As with any emergent model, the academy has collectively praised and damned him and his idea while constantly editing and adjusting it. Helmut Koester has taken the idea of early diversity to the extent of arguing that as soon as there were twelve apostles there were twelve Christianities,<sup>8</sup> while the more orthodox-minded I. Howard Marshall argued for a coherent, though not uniform, set of beliefs shared by even the “earlier” Christians, the writers of the New Testament.<sup>9</sup>

### *Model 3: Luther*

A third model should arguably be added to these two, though Bauer would lump it as a derivative of the Irenaeus, or ecclesiastical, model. It is a perspective presented by Martin Luther and many of the sixteenth-century Protestants. In his *Babylonian Captivity of the Church* Luther suggests that the Roman Catholic Church embodies the falling away and the anti-Christ predicted in the New Testament. He also wrote that her covering over the way of salvation with her mystagogical sacraments is the great apostasy. This model also represents a uniformity followed by diversity recovered into a uniformity, but the final uniformity, instead of being orthodoxy, is considered heresy which needs reformation. What remained to be demonstrated during the Reformation was how soon after the death of the apostles did the church go astray? I remember reading Luther describing the Babylonian captivity as being for a thousand years, but in another of his writings he suggested fifteen hundred years. Obviously these are round numbers, but the discrepancy shows the ambiguity of when Luther considered the church to have apostatized, closer to the first- or second-century or closer to the sixth-century. For Luther, Augustine and John Chrysostom were both to be read with great authority, but the earlier writer Origen was heretical.

These three models of Irenaeus, Walter Bauer, and Martin Luther all match some aspects of the historical data we can uncover. Irenaeus demonstrates that many subversive readings of scripture did arise in the second century and did attack an earlier orthodoxy. The two best-known examples of this being the

---

connection with the Holy Spirit which was not accepted by what became orthodox Christianity. See B. Aland, “Montanus – Montanism” in *Encyclopedia of Ancient Christianity*, 2:833, 834.

<sup>8</sup>Note that Koester also argues for a late date on the number twelve being associated with apostles. See Helmut Koester, *History and Literature of Early Christianity*, 2nd ed., vol. 2 (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1982), 8. See also sections 8-11.

<sup>9</sup>I. Howard Marshall, “Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earlier Christianity,” *Themelios* 2, no. 1 (1976): 5-14.

readings of Marcion, who radically separated the God of the Israel from the God of the Christians, and Valentinus, the Gnostic, who associated the major words of the New Testament with archons guarding the levels of the *pleroma*. Bauer is correct in his assertion that diversity did exist in the earliest church. Also, agreement on terminology representing God as Trinity and Christ as having two natures did culminate late, in the fourth and fifth centuries. Furthermore, Bauer's claim of triumphal writing of history did take place, Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* and Jerome's *Lives of Illustrious Men* being obvious examples. Luther's presentation of the Roman Catholic sacramental system actually getting in the way of salvation seems straight-forward enough to the Protestant mindset. Luther is correct in showing that the Roman positions are difficult to align with Scriptures. So all three models have some merit, but none are completely applicable to an Adventist understanding of the early church. Luther's model comes the closest, using some of the church fathers positively and some negatively, but does not allow for early diversity of Christian belief, nor is it specific enough on how or when the apostasy took place. None of these are an adequate model to demonstrate the development of Christianity in the early church for use within a contemporary and future Adventist seminary training.

#### *Seventh-day Adventist Models*

Now we turn to models four through eight that now function within Adventism to understand church history and point toward a ninth that I suggest may be a useful addition for the twenty-first century students of the early church.

#### Model 4: Truth Cannot Mix with Error

Often in discussions with Adventists and other Protestants on a topic in the early church I encounter the attitude that if someone has any of their theology wrong they are a heretic. This would be based on the model that truth and error cannot mix. With this model the task becomes very easy for an Adventist to show when the great apostasy took place: A.D. 96 with the first extant Christian writings outside the New Testament. Clement of Rome, writing to correct a usurpation of power by the younger church members in Corinth over their elders, refers in chapter five to the martyrs Paul and Peter now being in heaven. This, of course, most Adventists would agree is wrong theology, and every single extant writer in the church after that has mistaken theology of one stripe or another as judged by the 28 Fundamental Beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists. But this model is untenable in the light of the representations of Ellen White in the *Great Controversy*. She presents her chapter on the "Persecution in the First Centuries" in a very positive light.<sup>10</sup> The oft quoted "Let there be a revival of the faith and power of the early church, and the spirit of persecution will be revived, and the

<sup>10</sup>White, *The Great Controversy*, 39-48.

fires of persecution will be rekindled,” is the final sentence in that chapter.<sup>11</sup> Also, that same chapter, focusing on the first three centuries of the Christian era, quotes from Tertullian’s *Apology*, chapter 50, the familiar phrase, “the blood of Christians is seed.”<sup>12</sup> But her positive use of sections of this writer does not mean that Tertullian did not teach theological errors. He wrote that the Sabbath, along with circumcision, were temporary in their literal observance.<sup>13</sup> He also taught that repentance of sin after baptism must be accompanied by outward *exomologesis* which alone can prevent one from a perpetual punishment in hell-fire.<sup>14</sup> These beliefs disqualify Tertullian as one of the good guys according to a simple “truth and error do not mix” model, yet Ellen White is positive toward him.<sup>15</sup>

### Model 5: Present Truth

This brings up another Adventist model which is usually applied to the other end of the era of spiritual darkness: the idea of “present truth.” As applied to the Reformers, this model suggests that there are certain beliefs that are of most import during a certain time. Thus, the development of Christian theology is described in a stair-step reformation of one area of belief at a time being reformed. This model, used often by Ellen White, came to the forefront of my mind as I researched a short article on John Calvin for the *Ellen G. White Encyclopedia*.<sup>16</sup> I found that in three different places of the *Great Controversy* Ellen White positively addresses John Calvin.<sup>17</sup> She gives a summary statement of the work and influence of John Calvin and expresses her assessment of Calvin’s value to the work of God both in Geneva and across Europe. “His course as a public leader was not faultless, nor were his doctrines free from error. But he was instrumental in promulgating truths that were of special importance in his time.”<sup>18</sup> These final words include both a disclaimer and an affirmation. White would no doubt have rejected Calvin’s acceptance of the religious intolerance in Geneva and might have considered Calvin’s part in the condemnation and execution of Michael Servetus as a failure. Also, Calvin’s strong views on predestination directly contrasted her own Arminian position of human free will. In spite of these and other differences between Ellen White and John Calvin, she presents him as of

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., 48.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., 42.

<sup>13</sup>Tertullian, *An Answer to the Jews* 2-6, in *ANF* 3:153-157.

<sup>14</sup>Tertullian, *On Repentance* 9-12, in *ANF* 3:664-666.

<sup>15</sup>White, *The Great Controversy*, 41.

<sup>16</sup>John W. Reeve, “Calvin, John (1509-1564),” in *The Ellen G. White Encyclopedia*, ed. Denis Fortin and Jerry Moon (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2013), 673-675.

<sup>17</sup>White, *The Great Controversy*, 219-224, 233-234, 236.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., 236.

positive value to God in holding fast to the present truth of his time which included “the principles of Protestantism” such as justification by faith and the authority of Scriptures over tradition.<sup>19</sup> These positive elements of Calvin’s theology faithfully advanced in the face of the rising counter-Reformation during the second generation of the Reformation movement, make him, in the eyes of Ellen White, a positive Christian figure or one of the good guys of salvation history.

This present truth model works great in a Reformation setting of advancing truth, but it is harder to apply in a setting of receding truth, as with Tertullian, and yet, the same kind of principle seems to apply. Maybe White sees him as holding on to a truth which others are letting go. Maybe she sees him as spokesperson for a group of serious Christians who are willing to stand up for their beliefs in a time of persecution. One can hardly help respecting those persecuted for their faith during Tertullian’s time for their determined devotion. And yet, just one generation later, these very martyrs become a major difficulty as examples for those going through the persecutions in Carthage during the time of Cyprian.

#### Model 6: Remnant

Two other models, based on Ellen White’s handling of Christian history, suggest themselves from a paragraph in the middle of the chapter on “Persecution in the First Centuries” in *The Great Controversy*. White begins the paragraph with the statement, “Most of the Christians at last consented to lower their standard, and a union was formed between Christianity and paganism.” She then outlines the infiltration of idolatry through worshiping “images of Jesus, and even Mary and the saints.” She bemoans that “unsound doctrine, superstitious rites, and idolatrous ceremonies were incorporated” into the “faith and worship” of the church. Her final sentence of the paragraph states, “There were some, however, who were not misled by these delusions. They still maintained their fidelity to the Author of truth and worshiped God alone.”<sup>20</sup> This contrast between the many and the few lends itself well to the familiar Adventist model of “the Remnant.” As detailed from the prophecies of Isaiah by Gerhard Hasel, the “remnant motif is rooted in [the] dialectic of judgment and salvation.”<sup>21</sup> That is, God’s people are negatively judged, but a remnant is spared, or saved, to continue on the line of God’s people. This is expressed in Isa 6:11–13 as a tenth, which would be a visible remnant, that is again consumed until all that is left is root stalk or seed, which would be more like a potentiality than a visible remnant. Hasel calls this remains

<sup>19</sup>Ibid.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., 43.

<sup>21</sup>Gerhard F. Hasel, *The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah*, 2nd ed. (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1974), 224, 225.

of the destruction of the tenth an “irreducible remnant.”<sup>22</sup> In popular Adventist thought, as expressed in Sabbath School classes and fellowship meal discussions, the remnant model is used to describe not only the Protestant Reformation and the beginning of the Advent movement. This remnant model is used in describing Noah, Lot from Sodom, the separation of Judah and Israel, the Babylonian captivity of Judah, the partial return from Babylon to Jerusalem, the Christian separation from the Jews, and is of interest to us here to describe the woman clothed with the moon in contradistinction to the woman clothed in scarlet in the book of Revelation

The major difficulty with applying the remnant model to the early church is that it is hard to locate in history, any visible, or identifiable, group of Christians who did not participate in any “unsound doctrines, superstitious rites, [or] idolatrous ceremonies.” One could argue that Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople in the early fifth-century, was holding out for a piece of the truth when he refused to venerate Mary as *theotokos*, bearer of God. But his celebration of the Eucharist seems to be very little different than that of his predecessor John Chrysostom, and his Christology separated the two natures of Christ to such an extent as to have separate identifiable actions from each nature.<sup>23</sup> And, of course, there is the problem of his highly combative spirit. One could suggest that the seventh-century iconoclasts could have been a remnant holding out from the idolatry of the majority of the church. But they too seemed to have little difference in attitude or practice in regards to the veneration of the elements of the Eucharist. Besides, there is the problem that they apparently assimilated readily into Islam, with which they shared their iconoclastic virtue.<sup>24</sup> We have no record of much tension between them when Islam took over their area. But this just highlights how little we actually know. We certainly do not have enough records to illustrate a continuous, identifiable remnant throughout history, and if we could, it would simply be a different line of apostolic succession. The remnant model works much better as the seed or stump, latent and then growing again.

### Model 7: Visible and Invisible Church

This lack of identification of any continuous remnant linking the people of God in the New Testament with the people of God in the Protestant Reformation is often addressed with the second model suggested by the same paragraph quote

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., 240.

<sup>23</sup>Manlio Simonetti gives a sympathetic description of Nestorius and his Christology in “Nestorius – Nestorianism,” in *Encyclopedia of Ancient Christianity*, ed. Angelo Di Berardino, Thomas C. Oden, and Joel C. Elowsky, 3 vols. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2014), 2:907-909.

<sup>24</sup>Justo L. González, *The Story of Christianity*, vol. 1, rev. ed. (New York: HarperOne, 2010), 305, 306.

above by Ellen White in the *Great Controversy* chapter on the first centuries, that of the visible and invisible church.<sup>25</sup> In a general sense this model is actually at least as old as Tyconius' *Book of Rules*.<sup>26</sup> Tyconius was a Donatist Scriptural exegete writing from North Africa in the latter part of the fourth century. His *Book of Rules* is a set of seven hermeneutical keys which help to unlock the text of Scripture. The first rule, "The Lord and His Body" alerts the interpreter that at times Scriptures refers to the Lord's body meaning the actual body of Jesus Christ and sometimes to designate the church, the cosmic body of Christ.<sup>27</sup> The last rule, "The Devil and his Body" alerts the interpreter that there is a literal Devil who also has a body of "believers" who are warring against the Lord's Body.<sup>28</sup> Tyconius argues that Scriptures presents the church as bipartite, being both the body of Christ and containing the body of the Devil.<sup>29</sup> Throughout the *Book of Rules* Tyconius makes it clear that he perceives the church to contain the antichrist and so is looking within the church to find it.

Augustine, one of the authors that preserves this work of Tyconius, rejects this particular idea that the antichrist is within the church. In *The City of God* book 20, while exegeting the passage on the wheat and the tares in Matthew 13, Augustine rejects the notion that tares are ever really a part of the church.<sup>30</sup> One could argue that Tyconius anticipated the great apostasy and identified it in his own day in his own church, for which he was excommunicated by the Donatists and rejected by the Catholics. Augustine rejects any interpretation that places the Devil or his followers within the church, which has God's special blessing and protection, and the whole medieval church basically followed Augustine's lead for a thousand years.<sup>31</sup> During the Protestant Reformation this idea of the bipartite church is revived in terms of the church visible (antichrist) and the church invisible (the true people of God).<sup>32</sup> It did not take many generations before this terminology was used less as the new Protestant groups became visible churches.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>25</sup>White, *The Great Controversy*, 43. "There have ever been two classes among those who profess to be followers of Christ."

<sup>26</sup>Tyconius, *The Book of Rules*, trans. William S. Babcock. (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1989), ix, x.

<sup>27</sup>*Ibid.*, 3-9.

<sup>28</sup>*Ibid.*, 115-117.

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid.*, 15-21.

<sup>30</sup>Augustine, *Civ.* 20.9.

<sup>31</sup>*Ibid.*, 20.8.

<sup>32</sup>See A. T. Hanson, "Invisible Church, Visible Church," in *A Dictionary of Christian Theology* (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster, 1969), 173-175.

<sup>33</sup>*Ibid.* Note the shifts from Luther to Calvin and to the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England.

Models six and seven, the remnant and the visible/invisible church, work well together, the latter stressing the individual character of each believer while the former stresses movement through time.

#### Model 8: Maxwell's Toboggan and Tunnel

While in Seminary, I took a class on the history of the early church from C. Mervyn Maxwell. He had several sayings he would repeat from time to time to emphasize his points. Two of his sayings together make up a two-part model of the great apostasy. The first emphasizes the speed with which changes in Christian theology happened between the writing of the New Testament and other Christian writings which seem to have major theological differences: "The speed with which they tobogganed into apostasy takes ones breath away." Maxwell was referring to those doctrines which seem to change nearly immediately, literally within a few years or decades. These include the Sabbath and, to use an Adventist phrase denoting theological anthropology, the state of the dead. The second phrase refers to the difficulty of seeing the changes in worship and theology of church, ministry, and Eucharist during the second through fifth centuries: "The church is like a train going through a long, dark tunnel. It goes in as one thing but comes out as another."

These two are very helpful in conceptualizing the dynamics of the great apostasy. Some things changed so fast that the tradition of the church teaches that they never existed in Christian circles in any other way. Now, when I teach this section in my early church class I refer to three early deviations from Scripture in which the church over-accommodated to the surrounding Greco-Roman culture. In regards to the conception of the human person, the Hebrew Scriptures clearly indicate a unity.<sup>34</sup> The Gospels portray Jesus as teaching a unity with "soul sleep,"<sup>35</sup> though there are statements in Paul's writings that can be twisted either direction, depending on the pre-conceptions of the reader.<sup>36</sup> Howbeit the early church quickly accommodates to the super-culture and assumes soul survival after death<sup>37</sup> (though at first, not innate immortality, just that God continues to sustain souls after the death of the body).<sup>38</sup> Similarly with the Sabbath, the Hebrew Scriptures clearly teach a Sabbath from creation and law,<sup>39</sup> and the gospels portray

<sup>34</sup>*Seventh-day Adventists Believe: A Biblical Exposition of Fundamental Doctrines*, 2nd ed. (Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 2005), 93-97.

<sup>35</sup>Matt 9:24; John 11:11.

<sup>36</sup>For example, 1 Cor 7:34 and 1 Thess 5:23.

<sup>37</sup>Vittorino Corossi, "Soul," in *Encyclopedia of Ancient Christianity*, 3:620-622.

<sup>38</sup>"The immortality of the soul in this context was understood as a gift of God and not as a quality of the soul (Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 2.34.1-4)." See *ibid.*, 621.

<sup>39</sup>*Seventh-day Adventists Believe*, 281-285.

Jesus as Lord of the Sabbath, restoring it from abuses.<sup>40</sup> Again, there are statements in Paul's writings that can be twisted either direction, depending on the pre-conceptions of the reader.<sup>41</sup> Nonetheless, in many places the early Christians distance themselves from Jews by denying a literal Sabbath as soon as it was no longer politic to hide under the Jewish umbrella<sup>42</sup> (though there were places where both Sabbath and Sunday were kept, a few places clear through to modern times).<sup>43</sup>

A similar cultural accommodation occurs with the leadership of women. The Hebrew Scriptures give more rights and value to women than do the contemporary surrounding societies,<sup>44</sup> and the gospel portrays Jesus as giving leadership to women in His movement (John 4, 20). Once more, there are statements and mentioning of leadership in Paul's writings that can be twisted either direction depending on the pre-conceptions of the reader.<sup>45</sup> Even so, the early church very quickly abandons women in leadership roles of the church in favor of more culturally accepted views of women as inferior and having only domestic roles of leadership<sup>46</sup> (though there have been a few exceptions throughout history, mostly connected with monastic leadership of women).<sup>47</sup>

These quick deviations from Scripture were largely caused by accommodation to the super-culture, trying to fit in as an accepted religion. Obviously, many books have been and should yet be written on each of these topics,<sup>48</sup> but these are

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., 285, 286.

<sup>41</sup>Gal 4:10, 11; Col 2:16, 17.

<sup>42</sup>Samuele Bacchiocchi, *From Sabbath to Sunday: A Historical Investigation of the Rise of Sunday Observance in Early Christianity* (Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University, 1977), 169-173.

<sup>43</sup>Charles E. Bradford, *Sabbath Roots: The African Connection* (Barre, VT: Brown and Sons, 1999), 87-89.

<sup>44</sup>John W. Reeve, "Why Women Were Barred from Ordination in Christian Tradition," in *Women and Ordination: Biblical and Historical Studies*, ed. John W. Reeve (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2015), 49, 50.

<sup>45</sup>1 Cor 11:7-15; 1 Tim 2:12.

<sup>46</sup>Reeve, "Why Women Were Barred from Ordination in Christian Tradition," 56-58.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., 58, 59.

<sup>48</sup>F. L. Piper, *Conditionalism* (Boston: Advent Christian Pub. Soc., 1904); Oscar Cullmann, "Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?" in *Immortality and Resurrection*, ed. Krister Stendahl (New York: MacMillan, 1965), 9-53; LeRoy Edwin Froom, *The Conditionalist Faith of Our Fathers*, 2 vols. (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1966); Kenneth A. Strand, *The Sabbath in Scripture and History* (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1982); Linda L. Belleville et al, *Two Views on Women in Ministry* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2005); Ján Barna, *Ordination of Women in Seventh-day Adventist Theology: A Study in Biblical Interpretation* (Belgrade, Serbia: Preporod, 2012); Martin Hanna and Cindy



some quick examples of tobogganing away from scriptural principles toward the surrounding culture.

The tunnel concept, relating primarily to matters of church practice is more difficult to illustrate. Among the most widely held hermeneutics of the early church is the concept of conserving the received beliefs and practices. So, as the inevitable changes took place, they always had to be imaged as the received tradition from Christ through his apostles and through the established church leadership. For instance, through time the church orders changed from the second-century *Didache* to the *Apostolic Traditions* and *Didascalia* of the late third- or fourth-century, to the *Apostolic Constitutions* and *Constitutions of the Twelve Apostles* of the late fourth- or fifth-centuries. Yet, they all claimed to be presenting the church order taught by Jesus to His disciples. Similarly, through time the conceptualization of the church ministry changed, both as presented in these church orders and in the treatises, letters, and homilies extant. The same is true of the conceptualization and practices surrounding the Eucharist. The historical evidence suggests that they change from place to place and over time, yet they are always presented as the tradition, not as innovation. This creates the illusion of a dark tunnel where the train always stays on the track, yet over time changes dramatically. Eventually, the distance between the snapshots of ministry and worship in Scripture and the reality of church practice became so obvious that either a change in practice or a change in authority structures was needed. The history of the Middle Ages can be seen as a series of reforms and restructuring of authority giving the church more and more authority and the Scriptures less and less. But most of the practices and conceptualizations seen in church history which showed such distance from Scriptures had their beginnings in these early centuries of the church, in Maxwell's tunnel.

In the last few decades there has been an explosion of interest and studies in the early church. Many of the unstudied or understudied works of early church history are receiving major attention in the academy. One of the results of this vigorous attention is that the dark tunnel is getting lighter. More of the extant literature is being published in critical editions and modern translations making them more accessible and more familiar. There are still major lacunas in the trajectories of each idea and practice, but the information we do have is getting more attention and from less biased observers, and a clearer picture is coming to light. That which I struggled to picture about two decades ago in my master's thesis in regards to the development of the priesthood is considered common knowledge now. New major studies on baptism, Eucharist, and ministry are now

---

Tutsch, eds., *Questions and Answers About Women's Ordination* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2014).

showing up yearly, and the picture they are portraying emphasizes the differences and developments across geography and over time.<sup>49</sup>

Frances Young in her recent chapter “Ministerial Forms and Functions in the Church Communities of the Greek Fathers,” writes concerning the time of John Chrysostom (died A.D. 407), “Christian worship, it appears, was increasingly assimilating the religious features of a dying paganism.”<sup>50</sup> My Lutheran friend Craig Satterlee, in his recent published dissertation on *Ambrose of Milan’s Method of Mystagogical Preaching* suggests that “the chief representatives of this genre of homily are the mystagogical catecheses of Ambrose of Milan, Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, and Theodore of Mopsuestia.”<sup>51</sup> All of these are from the same generation, a generation that felt a great need to guide the neophytes into knowledge of the Christian mysteries, the sacraments. Sacraments which, after years of slow transition, have been transformed into something quite different from what they began as nearly four-hundred years before. In my M.A. thesis, I followed the transition of Christian elder into Christian priest from the New Testament to this same generation in the person of Gregory of Nyssa.<sup>52</sup> These three examples of studies through time which culminate in the late-fourth and early-fifth centuries illustrate a wealth of new insights and information on the early centuries which are lighting Maxwell’s dark tunnel.

### *Who are the Good Guys? Who are the Bad Guys?*

So, to return to Tyconius’ body of Christ and body of the Devil, who are these people that brought about these changes that turned the church of God into antichrist? Sometimes the only way to know the story is to hear the story. History is, after all, a series of stories about people like you and me, who often times struggles to do what’s right while making large blunders. Cyprian of Carthage is an example of this. As he faced massive upheaval and confusion in the North African church at the culmination of the Decian persecution, many of the confessors in prison for their faith were granting forgiveness to the lapsed (those who had denied Christianity in face of persecution), and some of the presbyters

<sup>49</sup> E.g. Everett Ferguson, *Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries*. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009); Andrew Brian McGowan, *Ancient Christian Worship: Early Church Practices in Social, Historical, and Theological Perspective*. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academics, 2014).

<sup>50</sup> Frances Young, “Ministerial Forms and Functions in the Church Communities of the Greek Fathers” in *Community Formation in the Early Church and in the Church Today*, ed. Richard N. Longenecker (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002), 173.

<sup>51</sup> Craig Alan Satterlee, *Ambrose of Milan’s Method of Mystagogical Preaching* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2002), 3.

<sup>52</sup> John W. Reeve, “The Presbyter: Jewish Elder to Christian Priest” (M.A. thesis, Andrews University, 1997).

were encouraging them in order to subvert Cyprian's authority. To reestablish order he argued that only the bishops can forgive sins.<sup>53</sup> Then, in the Valerian persecution a few years later, Cyprian gave up his life in order not to discredit his Lord, giving a martyr's force to his words.<sup>54</sup> Cyprian's dependence on the tradition from Tertullian that an ordered penance must precede a church orchestrated bestowal of salvation through the Eucharist left him with few options other than narrowing access to this salvation by the church through the bishops only.<sup>55</sup> Thus Cyprian becomes a part of the pathway toward sacramentalism, yet he stood up for Christ to his very death. Is he a good example or a bad example in church history?

How about Irenaeus, to use an example more likely to be viewed as positive to an Adventist? He sets the agenda for much of Scriptural interpretation and theology which is viewed nearly universally as positive. It was Irenaeus who was most influential in helping the early church to articulate that the four gospels we have in our Bibles today, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, are to be viewed exclusively as the best gospels from which to understand Jesus Christ. He helped to retrieve the gospel story from the Gnostic presentations that would turn the Christian message into a series of secret codes for use by the soul after death in its ascent through the heavens to the realm of light. It was Irenaeus who led the church in understanding Scriptures to reveal a Christ who, in His incarnation, was fully man and fully God at the same time, preparing the way for the fifth century understanding of the dual nature of Christ.<sup>56</sup> However, it was also Irenaeus who did these things partially through his insistence on an apostolic succession of truth which became the safety net against heretical readings of Scriptures.<sup>57</sup> Irenaeus set the stage for the Bible to take second place to the apostolic tradition.<sup>58</sup> So, was Irenaeus a good guy or bad guy; was he a valiant speaker of Christ's truth or a dangerous developer of a false system of truth? It is a very good thing that we are not the ultimate judges; but we must critically evaluate what we are to copy. As we stand on Irenaeus' shoulders we must dodge his mistakes even while we respect and emulate his good qualities. The good guys are the bad guys.

All eight of these models presented have helpful aspects. The Irenaeus model reminds us that there is a truth to be preserved, but that this truth must be critiqued continually by Scriptures rather than having Scriptures subservient to traditional truth. Bauer's model reminds us of the complexity of the development of early Christianity. Luther's model calls us to find salvation through the Christ

<sup>53</sup>Cyprian, *Unit. eccl.* 17, 18.

<sup>54</sup>Pontius the Deacon, *The Life and Passion of Cyprian*.

<sup>55</sup>Cyprian, *Unit. eccl.* 6-8.

<sup>56</sup>Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 3.18, 19.

<sup>57</sup>*Ibid.*, 3.1, 2.

<sup>58</sup>*Ibid.*, 3.4.

of Scripture rather than through any church system. The principle that truth cannot mix with error reminds us to strive for purity of truth but must be balanced with the concept of present truth which recognizes that while truth does not mix with error, we humans conceive of truth progressively, as we are able. The remnant motif and the visible/invisible church models remind us that we must be in relation and submission to God, not just reliant on our church or fellow believers. Maxwell's toboggan and tunnel remind us that Christ and Paul did warn of a falling away, and that when we see the difference and the distance between church and Scriptures in history, we must go with the Bible. All these models are helpful, but they miss two important components. For these we turn to the last model: The good guys are the bad guys.

Model 9. The Good Guys Are the Bad Guys/  
The Bad Guys Are the Good Guys

This last model about the good guys and the bad guys being the same guys reminds us that we must stand on the shoulders of those who have gone before us, emulating what is good, appreciating their struggles, but not to follow in their missteps. It also confronts us with a reality that is not overt in any of the other models: that these good bad guys, or bad good guys, are like us. They are not "other." The leaders in the early church were humans very similar to ourselves. When they struggled to do what is right and made mistakes, they are like us. When they let hunger for power cloud their Spirit-guided judgment, they are like us. When they withstood the temptation to give up under pressure and with deep prayer push for a solution to the seemingly insolvable, they are like us. When they assumed that their own will and the will of God are one, and ended up making major blunders because of it, they are like us. This stands as a warning that we too, who obviously view ourselves as the current good guys, must be humble as we interpret Scriptures, do theology, and practice our Christianity through living and worship, because time will tell what part we have gotten wrong, where we might also be the bad guys. But, it also means that when we look at each other and see so many faults and we feel that all those around us must be the bad guys, time will tell whether we might also be the good guys. This is what both Augustine and the Donatists rejected in the message of Tyconius: both good and evil are within us and we must discern how to go forward in spite of this. We do not have the luxury of leading God's church without making mistakes.

The usefulness of this model in seminary instruction on the early church is the focus. Not just focusing on the theology and doctrine, as important as that is, nor only focusing on what went wrong, as important as that is, but also focusing on the stories of humans like us struggling to serve God in difficult circumstances. We must see both warnings and hope from the early church to apply to our own ministries.



## **THE EIGHTH EMPIRE: NEW HYPOTHESES FOR THE SYMBOLS OF REVELATION 17**

VANDERLEI DORNELES  
Doctor in Science  
(Editor, Brazil Publishing House)  
van.dorneles@cpb.com.br

### *Abstract*

This article analyzes the prophetic symbols of Rev 17 with the purpose of exploring the relations among the scarlet beast, the first beast of Rev 13 and the dragon of Rev 12. The parallel among the three symbols is used as a basis to suggest a relation between the restored leopard-like beast and the harlot, and between the two-horned beast and the scarlet beast in his eighth king phase. The study is done in light of the Old Testament (OT) context in which the symbols of the dragon and beasts, used by John, are related to political powers that persecuted Israel. The eighth king is distinguished from religious power and related to a specific political power in the end times.

Keywords: Book of Revelation, Revelation 17, prophetic interpretation, Apocalypse, prophecy, New Testament studies.

### *Introduction*

Revelation 17 is one of the most challenging and fascinating sections of Revelation. One of the angels who have the seven bowls of God's wrath (Rev 16) calls the prophet to a new sequence of visions, which follows the narrative of the plagues. The angel starts by announcing, "I will show you the judgment of the great harlot" (Rev 17:1).

The harlot's identity is less discussed than the identities of the beast and his heads. One current interpretation is that the beast is the same entity represented by the dragon of Rev 12 and the beast of Rev 13: the Roman Empire, whose capital was considered the "city of seven hills," as suggested by Rev 17:9. In this perspective, the seven kings of Rev 17:10 would be seven Roman emperors.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>About dating the book of Revelation in A.D. 95 based on the notion that the seven kings are seven Roman emperors, see Stephen S. Smalley, *The Revelation to John: A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Apocalypse* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2005), 435-437; Joseph L. Trafton, *Reading Revelation: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2005), 158-159; and Grant R. Osborne, *Revelation: Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2002).

Mounce states that John's readers of the first century would have no doubt in understanding this reference to anything other than Rome, the city built on seven hills.<sup>2</sup> This preterist interpretation is embraced by a "majority of exegetes,"<sup>3</sup> but denies the prophetic gift in the visions narrated in Revelation.

Another line of interpretation sees the scarlet beast as a symbol of the world powers and the eighth king as a return of the seventh one, that is, papal Rome. In this case, the phrase "eighth king" indicates that the entity is in its final phase of existence, after the restoration of its powers removed by the French Revolution in 1798.<sup>4</sup>

A third interpretation relates the scarlet beast (Rev 17) to the red dragon (Rev 12) and reads them as referring to Satan himself in his last fight against God and His people.<sup>5</sup> Another alternative view suggests that the eighth king is also the scarlet beast and represents a "worldwide confederacy of civil and secular power" in opposition to God in the end times.<sup>6</sup>

A more popular interpretation, less grounded theologically, sees the scarlet beast as papal Rome and holds that the creation of the Vatican City State, in 1929, by the Lateran Treaty corresponds to the healing of the beast's mortal wound in Rev 13. In this view, the seven kings represented by the heads of the beast are

<sup>2</sup>Robert H. Mounce, *The Book of Revelation*, The New International Commentary on the New Testament, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 313, 314.

<sup>3</sup>Alan F. Johnson, "Revelation," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, ed. Frank E. Gaebelin (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1981), 12:554. Johnson believes the "interpretation of this chapter [17] controls the interpretation of the whole book of Revelation" (ibid., 553).

<sup>4</sup>See Ranko Stefanovic, *Revelation of Jesus Christ* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2002), 515, 516; Francis D. Nichol, ed., *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1980), 7:854-856.

<sup>5</sup>See Ekkehardt Mueller, "The Beast of Revelation 17: A Suggestion [Part 1]," *Journal of Asia Adventist Seminary* 10, no. 1 (2007): 45. Osborne considers that the eighth king of Rev 17:11 is "the Antichrist himself, that is killed and then raised from the dead in another 'great imitation' of Christ" in the last time. According to him, "the Antichrist will assume power and take upon himself divine attributes but is the absolute opposite of divinity" (on Rev 13). See Osborne, *Revelation*, 513, 615. Beale understands that, in the eighth king phase, "the beast appears temporally to defeat the entire church community in the end time". However, "his victory will be short-lived", and "he will soon thereafter go to destruction." The "threefold formula corresponds to the career of Satan in 20:1-10, so that both refer to the same events from the vantage point respectively of the beast and of Satan." See G. K. Beale, *Revelation: A Shorter Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2015), 364. However, this perspective ignores that the beast and kings are destroyed by Christ's manifestation, before the millennium (Rev 19:20), and Satan is killed after the millennium (Rev 10).

<sup>6</sup>Jon Paulien, *Armageddon at the Door* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2008), 136, 212, 218; see Nichol, *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, 7:851.

seven popes, and the eighth will be a last pope who maintains certain relations with his predecessor.<sup>7</sup>

The diversity of interpretations reflects the complexity of the vision. One of the challenges is that many apocalyptic symbols are described as “beasts” (Rev 11:7; 13:1, 11; 17:3). The Greek word *thērion* (“beast”) occurs 38 times in Revelation, and it is always translated as “beast.”

Interpretations that identify the scarlet beast with the first beast of Rev 13:1 or with papal Rome face a clear problem. In Rev 17:16, the scarlet beast and the ten kings “hate” and destroy the harlot (Roman religious power).<sup>8</sup> The relation between the scarlet beast and Satan seems to take out the beast from the immediate context of the seven plagues and ignore the meaning of the verb “sit” (*kathemai*, in Rev 17:3, 9; 18:7) which indicates that the woman exercise control over the beast. “The “confederacy” of secular powers,<sup>9</sup> instead of the scarlet beast, may represent the coalition formed by the beast and the “kings of the earth” (Rev 16:14; 17:12-14). Thus, a more clear definition of the entity represented by the symbol is required.

This article intends to explore the evidences for the following hypotheses: (1) the scarlet beast and the harlot represent distinct entities that are religious and political respectively; (2) the eighth king represents a concrete historical and political entity at the eschatological climax; and (3) the eighth king may be the same as the two-horned beast described in Rev 13:11.

Revelation is a book of the New Testament (NT), but it is rooted in the imagery and languages of the OT. Thus, one must search for its main symbols in the Hebrew Scripture.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>7</sup>Patricia Ann Sunday says that “the Lateran Treaty proclaimed Pius XI as the first holy Roman Empire’s Catholic king/pope,” and “he literally became king of the Vatican State” in February 11, 1929, and the successor of Benedict XVI will be the eighth and last pope. See Patricia Ann Sunday, *Nostradamus, Branham and the Little Book: God’s Masterpiece* (Bloomington, IN: Author House, 2012), 300). Barho and Mbeledogu say that since Pius XI was the “first monarch of the Vatican,” Benedict XVI was the seventh king/pope, and the eighth will “not be human” and his reign will endure only seven years. See Onoso Barho and Obi Mbeledogu, *The Eighth King is Here* (Dartford, UK: Xlibris Corporation, 2012); cf. Paulien, *Armageddon at the Door*, 215, 216).

<sup>8</sup>In Rev 17:16 KJV, ignores the Greek particle *kai* (“and”) between the ten horns and the beast which is translated by NIV and NAS.

<sup>9</sup>Paulien, *Armageddon at the Door*, 212.

<sup>10</sup>Paulien argues that “Revelation cannot be understood without continual reference to the OT,” as it is a “perfect mosaic of the passages from the OT.” The recurring references to the OT in the book of Revelation indicate that it is the main key to “decode” the message of Revelation. See Jon Paulien, “Interpreting Revelation’s Symbolism,” in *Symposium on Revelation: Introductory and Exegetical Studies*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 1992), 1:80.



### *The Vision*

Revelation 17 is composed of three parts: a speech from the angel (v. 1, 2), a vision of the symbols (vv. 3-6), and another speech from the angel (vv. 7-18). The vision is clearly symbolic. But the two speeches should be considered explanations of the vision and are therefore, literal and temporal in the sense that they reveal the symbols and occur in the time and circumstances of the prophet.<sup>11</sup> The angel uses the past tense when speaking of the harlot and her sins. With her, “the kings of the earth *committed* fornication” and “the inhabitants of the earth *were* made drunk” (v. 2). This fornication or prostitution indicates idolatry (see Eze 16, 23; Jer 51).

In the second speech, the angel uses verbs in the three fundamental tenses when referring to the identity of the beast.<sup>12</sup> He says that five of the seven kings “have fallen,” “one is,” and another “has not yet come” (v. 10). He also says that the “ten kings” have not yet received their kingdom, but will receive it (v. 12). He adds that the ten kings and the beast “will make war” against the Lamb (v. 14) and “will hate” the harlot (v. 16).<sup>13</sup>

The vision of Rev 17 is part of the set of visions concerning the seven plagues (Rev 15:5-18:24), which starts with a scene of the heavenly sanctuary in which the end of the mediation is indicated (Rev 15:5-8). Thus the context shows God’s judgment on those who bear the “mark of the beast” (16:2; cf. 14:9, 10) and the harlot (Rev 17:18). Divine vengeance on the “beast,” “false prophet,” and “dragon” comes later (Rev 19:20, 21; 20:10). Paulien says Rev 17 may be considered an “exegesis of Revelation 16:12-16”<sup>14</sup> and should be read as a unit.

### *Identity of the Beast*

In its structural aspects, the beast of Rev 17 relates to the red dragon (12:3) and the beast of Rev 13. However, the scarlet beast should not be identified as Satan,

<sup>11</sup>Paulien, *Armageddon at the Door*, 214, 215.

<sup>12</sup>Within the prophecies, the consistent use of future tense in explanations by angels and others supports the claim that every explanation is given “in the time of the prophet.” See Paulien, *Armageddon at the Door*, 214, 215; cf. Kenneth Strand, *Interpreting the Book of Revelation* (Worthington, OH: Ann Arbor Publ., 1979), 54. The use of verb tenses in Daniel provides a basis for this principle (see Dan 2:31-35, 36-44; 7:1-15, 16-27; 8:3-12, 13-14, 19-25; 9:25-27). Except when he identifies the symbols as the represented entities (“those great beasts, which are four, are four kings,” Dan 7:17), he uses the future tense consistently (“which shall arise out of the earth,” Dan 7:17).

<sup>13</sup>The harlot of Rev 17 echoes the OT figure of Jezebel. They both practice prostitution (2 Kgs 9:22; Rev 17:2, 4, 5), shed the blood of saints and prophets (2 Kgs 9:7; Rev 17:6; 18:20, 24), and have their flesh consumed (1 Kgs 21:23; 2 Kgs 9:36; Rev 17:16).

<sup>14</sup>Paulien, *Armageddon at the Door*, 208.

since animals, beasts, and horns represent secular political powers, not spiritual entities (see Dan 7:17, 24; 8:20, 21).

John uses the Greek word *thērion* (“beast”) 38 times, the most of them to the beasts with seven heads and ten horns. He also uses the Greek nouns *drakon*, “dragon” (13 times), and *ophis*, “snake” (four times), interchangeably in reference to Satan. The use of these words and metaphors in the OT may suggest what would have been in John’s mind when he used those terms to describe the animals shown to him as symbols. Because the dragon of Rev 12 and the beasts of Rev 13:1 and 17 all have a consistent seven heads and ten horns, they may be viewed as a single symbol that is reconfigured each time it appears. Therefore, in the three visions the structure is the same, but details change according to the context of each vision.

The noun *thērion* is used in the OT Greek version to translate the Hebrew *chay*, which refers to animals and beasts in general (see Gen 1:24; Ps 49:10). However, the word is also used in a metaphorical sense. Ezekiel says that, in captivity, the sheep of Israel were “scattered” and became “food for the *beasts* of the field” (Eze 34:5, NKJV). Predicting the restoration, the prophet says that God would bring them together “from the countries” (v. 13) and destroy the “wild beasts” (v. 25). Then God guarantees: “And they shall know that I am the Lord, when I have broken the bands of their yoke and delivered them from the hand of *those who enslaved them*. And they shall no longer be a prey for the *nations*, nor shall *beasts* of the land devour them” (v. 27, 28, italics added). In these verses, the Hebrew word used is the singular *chay*, “beast,” but it is rendered in plural by the Greek text, as *thēria*.

Thus, Ezekiel refers to the nations that enslaved Israel with the metaphor of the “beast.” The end of captivity, when God would break the “yoke” of bondage, would result in the destruction of the “beast.” Isaiah also prophesies the end of captivity with parallel language: “In that day the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people who are left, from Assyria and Egypt ... Shinar [Babylon]” (Isa 11:11, 12; cf. Micah 7:12).

In these parallel prophecies, the beast is a metaphor for Egypt, Assyria, and Babylon, the enemies who enslaved the covenant people. The Hebrew *chay* (Gr. *thērion*) is also used for the beasts of Daniel 7. Thus, the OT provides a background for the figure of the beast described by John and provides the identity of the first possible powers referred by the angel, as the ones that have passed in John’s time.

Dragons and serpents also are common in the OT as symbols of forces opposing God. Interestingly, the OT relates the dragon to Egypt and Babylon, two empires presumably represented by heads of the beast (Rev 17).<sup>15</sup> In the *proto-*

<sup>15</sup>The LXX uses the Gr. noun *drakon* 30 times to translate the Heb. *tannin*, “dragon,” “serpent,” or “sea monster,” and the Heb. *liryathan*, “dragon,” “leviathan,” or “sea

*gospel*, the Son of the woman crushed the head of the “serpent,” from Heb. *nachash* (*ophis*, LXX, Gen 3:15). In the Exodus, God crushed the head of a *tannyin* (*drakōn*, LXX, Ps 74:13, 14; Isa 51:9; see Eze 29:3; 32:2), which is translated as “dragon,” “sea monster,” and “serpent.” Babylon is called a *tannyin* (*drakōn*, LXX) that crushed Judah, but that would be destroyed by the Lord (Jer 51:34, 36, 37). In the day of the Lord, He will permanently crush the *tannyin* (*drakōn*, LXX) and *līnyathan* (*drakōn*, LXX), as well as the snake, which is *nachash* (*ophis*, in LXX, Isa 27:1; Isa 11:11 specifically mentions Egypt, Assyria, and Babylon [“Shinar”] as powers to be destroyed in the day of the Lord). In Revelation, Christ defeats the kings and the beast in the second coming (Rev 19:19, 20), or in the OT day of the Lord. Thus, the symbols of the dragon and beast are related to persecutors and political powers.

Alan F. Johnson embraces this reading by saying that Leviathan, Rahab, and dragon (serpent) in the OT refer to “political powers, such as Egypt and Assyria, that were threatening Israel”.<sup>16</sup> Robert H. Mounce also says Leviathan, or “marine monster”, in Ps 74:13, “is Egypt”, and in Isa 27:1, the same figure corresponds to “Assyria and Babylon”.<sup>17</sup>

Thus, the figure described by John in Rev 12, 13, and 17 as a dragon or a beast may be a reproduction of the *tannin* or *līnyathan* (the seven-headed monster of Canaanite mythology which represented the forces of evil)<sup>18</sup> and the *ophis* of the OT. This would be consistent with the idea that the book of Revelation is rooted in OT language and imagery. If so, the ancient prophets clearly identify three of the entities represented by heads of the monster: Egypt, Assyria, and Babylon.<sup>19</sup>

---

monster.” *Ophis* is used 29 times to translate the Heb. *nachash*, “serpent” or “snake,” and the Heb. *ephel*, “viper” or “snake.”

<sup>16</sup>Johnson, “Revelation,” 525.

<sup>17</sup>Mounce, *The Book of Revelation*, 232.

<sup>18</sup>See Nichol, *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, 4:206; Johnson, “Revelation,” 524; Alexander Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1942), 107-114; E. A. Wallis Budge, *The Gods of the Egyptians* (New York: Dover Publications, 1969), 1:278, 279.

<sup>19</sup>The interpretation that the “seven mountains” (v. 9) are the seven hills of Rome contradicts the logic that the beast and the harlot represent different entities. The Greek noun *oros* should be translated as “mountains.” The NIV translates it as “hills,” but in this case “a previous exegesis has influenced” the translation (Johnson, “Revelation,” 559). The seven “mountains” should be considered within the Hebrew context, that is, as kingdoms (see Isa 37:32; see also Ps 48:2; Jer 51:25; Dan 2:35, 9:20; Zec 4:7). The same occurs with the term “king,” which OT used as the equivalent of “kingdom” (see Dan 7:17; 8:21, 23). About the relation between the “mountains” and the Roman Church, Johnson still argues that these symbols “belong to the beast [political power], not to Babylon [religious power].” See Johnson, “Revelation,” 560; Nichol, *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, 7:851. Beale argues that the hills (Gr. *oros*) is figurative, meaning “strength”, rather than literal. “This usage [‘seven hills’] points beyond a literal reference to

In addition, Dan 7 extends this list by using the term “beast” to describe the animals that represents in his visions Babylon, Persia, Greece, and imperial Rome.

If what was in John’s mind is the picture of the OT *chay*, *tannin* or *lityathan* as a representation of satanic forces when he used the Gr. words *drakōn* and *thērion* to describe the beasts that he saw, then *drakōn* and *thērion* would be parallel symbols in Revelation as those OT pictures are as well. And it is possible to say that the same symbol is reconfigured in Rev 12, 13, and 17 according to a new perspective in each vision. In chapter 12, the focus is on the Roman Empire, or the sixth head; in 13, it is the popes’ empire, the seventh head;<sup>20</sup> and in 17, the focus is on the eschatological climax with the eighth king.

In the three visions shown to John, the power behind the represented entities is Satan, but he is acting against God’s people through earthly and historical powers. Thus, the beast and dragon symbolize the satanic power embodied by a persecutor empire, which rises and falls with each new empire.<sup>21</sup>

The fact that the “red dragon” fights against Christ at the time of the Roman Empire (Rev 12:4) and persecutes the church during the papal empire (12:13, 14) and the end times (12:17) suggests that the symbol structure may be the same. In each of these periods, a different head of the monster would be active. In Rev. 13:3 John says that “one of his heads” was “mortally wounded,” presumably the seventh one, which becomes active in that period of history.

Thus, the OT clarifies the identity of the first heads of the dragon and the beast by using the Hebrew words *chay* [gr. *thērion*], *tannin* and *lityathan* in reference to Egypt and Babylon. It also includes Assyria when it says that God will arise against his people’s enemies on the day of the Lord (Isa. 11:11). Since the angel’s explanation on Rev 17:10 occurs in the temporal perspective of the prophet—that is, in the first century—five of those earthly powers had passed (Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Persia, and Greece), one remained (Rome), and the seventh one was yet

---

Rome’s hills to the figurative meaning of kingdoms, especially in the light of Rev 8:8 and 14:1, where mountains figuratively refer to kingdoms” (Beale, *Revelation*, 366).

<sup>20</sup>The angel’s affirmation that the seventh kingdom (papal Rome) would endure a “little” (1,260 years!) can be understood from the perspective of ensuring the victory of God’s faithfulness achieved on the cross and not from the viewpoint of chronological time. The adjective “little” (Gr. *oligon*, v. 10) is also used in Revelation to say that the dragon, after the cross, knew that he had a “little time” (*oligon kairon*, 12:12). On the other hand, John says that the dragon will be released after the millennium, but for a “short time,” using the Gr. *mikron kronon* (20:3), indicating a measured length of time (see also 1 Pet 1:6, which uses *oligon* to indicate unmeasured time).

<sup>21</sup>This view fits the angel’s definition that the beast “was, and is not, and will ascend” (v. 8, 11), which would be a parody of the dragon’s claim to be like God, “who is and who was and who is to come” (Rev 1:4, 8, 4:8), the only “I AM” (Exod 3:14).

to come (papal Rome).<sup>22</sup> Paulien says that “the image of a seven-headed beast represents a beast that lives, dies, and is resurrected seven or eight times.”<sup>23</sup>

Jacques Doukhan suggests that the local and temporal context of Rev 17 is the “desert” (Gr. *eremos*; 17:3) which would be the period when the pure woman is persecuted during the Middle Ages (see Rev 12:14). In parallel to this point, he argues that “the 10-horned beast [Rev 13:1] covers the historical period announced in the vision of Daniel 7” which would be from Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome, until papal Rome.<sup>24</sup> From this perspective, he sees the phase indicated by the angel’s words “one is” (Rev 17:10) as the “period of absence”, after the fatal wound on the beast, or the time of the “sixth king,” when according to him, there is a “paradoxical state of this [sixth] king, who ‘exists’ even though he looks as if he is dead.”<sup>25</sup>

However, this viewpoint ignores the background of the dragon and beasts in the whole OT that indicates Egypt and Assyria as part of the persecutors kings represented by those symbols. Besides that, when the angel talks to the prophet, they are located in prophet’s time. Daniel saw four beasts in the “great sea”, but when he listened to the angel explanation the perspective is his own time (see Dan 7:2, 17). It is important also to realize that John does not use the definitive article before the word *eremos*, in Rev 17:3, which implies he is talking about a new situation or symbol. When he intentionally mention one symbol already referred in his visions he uses a definitive article.

In addition, Beale says that the transportation “in spirit into a desert” alludes to Isa 21:1-2, “where a vision from God is revealed to the prophet Isaiah and is described as coming ‘from the wilderness, from a terrifying land’ (Isa 21:1).” He argues that “this allusion is confirmed by the fact that Isa. 21:1-10 is a vision of judgment against Babylon and by the fact that the phrase ‘fallen, fallen is Babylon’ of Isa 21:9 appears in Rev 18:2.”<sup>26</sup> Trafton also points out that, by eliminating the definitive article in Rev 17:3, John indicates “this is ‘a’ wilderness, not ‘the wilderness’.” Thus, “John has borrowed the notion of ‘wilderness’ not from chapter 12 but from Isa 21:1, which speaks of Babylon (17:5) as the ‘wilderness of the sea’.”<sup>27</sup>

<sup>22</sup>About this list, see Paulien *Armageddon at the Door*, 218; Nichol, *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, 7:855; Kenneth A. Strand, “The Seven Heads: Do They Represent Roman Emperors?” in *Symposium on Revelation*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring: Biblical Research Institute, 1992), 2:191.

<sup>23</sup>Paulien, *Armageddon at the Door*, 211.

<sup>24</sup>Jacques B. Doukhan, *Secrets of Revelation* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2002), 163.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid.

<sup>26</sup>Beale, *Revelation*, 355.

<sup>27</sup>Trafton, *Reading Revelation*, 155.

Therefore, the identification of the heads of the dragon and beasts from Egypt until Greece has a solid grounding in the OT, from which the main figures of John's visions are extracted.

### *The Eighth King*

In Rev 17:11, the angel adds information to the vision by pointing out the emergence of an eighth element: "And the beast . . . is himself also the eighth, and is of the seven" (v. 11).

The text of Rev 17:11 has been translated in different ways depending on the Greek particle *kai*, which precedes the Greek pronoun *autos* ("he") and the ordinal adjective *ogdoós* ("eighth"). The particle *kai* can signify the conjunction "and," but is also used as an adverb that may be translated as "also," "even," or "equally" (see Matt 5:39f, 46; 12:45f; Mark 8:7; Acts 13:9). The NIV ignores the particle and says, "The beast who once was, and now is not, is an eighth king." The KJV translates *kai* as "even": "The beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth." The NKJV renders it as "also": "The beast that was, and is not, is himself also the eighth." The NKJV and KJV translations seem more suited to the context, since the beast or the dragon is the power working in each of the heads or "kings," including the eighth: the beast is each one of its seven heads and is *also* the eighth. This accords with the background of the seven-headed dragon symbol, which is associated in the OT with Egypt, Assyria, and Babylon, political and temporal empires. Interpreting the beast itself as the eighth suggests that it is not each one of its seven heads, but only the eighth. This separates the beast from its own heads, which would be strange given that the symbol is a single unit.

Mounce insists in distinguishing the eighth king from the previous seven. He points out that this element "is an eighth [king] in the sense that he is distinct from the other seven" and he is "of the seven [*ek ton hepta*]" and not "one of the seven." In this condition, the eighth "plays the same sort of role as his earthly predecessors," and his period of hegemony "is the great tribulation preceding the return of the Messiah."<sup>28</sup>

<sup>28</sup>Mounce, *The Book of Revelation*, 318. By ignoring this Greek construction, George Eldon Ladd says, "the second and final manifestation of the beast is in an eighth king; but it is not the eighth king for there are only seven; it is an eighth king which is one of the seven." According to him, this suggests that "one of the seven is to experience two stages of his existence," and this king would be shortly followed by an eighth, "who is the seventh in his full antichristian manifestation." See George Eldon Ladd, *A Commentary on the Revelation of John* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972), 231. In the same view, Bullinger points out that the eighth "is 'of the seven,' that is to say, he is the 7th in another (his 8th, or superhuman) form. And though he is 'an eighth' king, there are not really eight, but only seven, for the seventh and eighth are the same personage." See Ethelbert Bullinger, *Commentary on Revelation, Or, the Apocalypse* (New York: Cosimo, 2007), 542.

The absence of the definite article before the adjective masculine ordinal *ogdoós* (“eighth”) does not necessarily favor the idea that this eighth is the beast itself (gr. *thērion*, which is a neutral noun).<sup>29</sup> It simply means that this is a new element in the vision.<sup>30</sup> Since the adjective *ogdoós* is masculine, it can be related to “kings” (gr. *basileus*, a masculine plural noun). In this case, in the context of the description of the seven kings (v. 10, 11), it would be more natural to see the “eighth” as a historical king/empire than as the beast itself.

The fact that the angel says five kings have fallen, one exists, and the seventh will come (v. 10) suggests a consecutive relation and similarity among the seven kings and the eighth element. Furthermore, the angel adds that the eighth “proceeds” (Gr. *ek*, “origin”) from the seven, suggesting that an eighth empire is predicted to follow the seventh one. The beast itself can’t “proceed” from the seven empires.

If the beast is “also an eighth,” it should be concluded that he is each one of the empires represented by his seven heads.<sup>31</sup> In this case, he represents the imperial powers or “political agencies” that have opposed God throughout history.<sup>32</sup> Each of these world empires, the moment it becomes a persecutor of God’s people, can be seen as the embodiment of Satan’s rule in the world.<sup>33</sup> Thus, “every head of the beast is a partial incarnation of satanic power that governs the world for a period.”<sup>34</sup> God may also use empires to support the remnant, as

<sup>29</sup>See Nichol, *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, 7:856.

<sup>30</sup>When John describes something for the first time, he does that without the definite article (see Rev 12:1, 3, 13:1, 11, 17:3).

<sup>31</sup>Another unified symbol representing several empires as one unique element can be seen in Dan 2: the statue seen by Nebuchadnezzar whose elements (gold, silver, bronze, iron, and clay) are destroyed by the stone that falls from the sky, suggesting that the empires pass, but the power behind them remains until the arrival of the kingdom of Christ, when it shall be completely destroyed.

<sup>32</sup>“The beast in itself may be identified with the work of Satan through political agencies, at all the times, which submit to his control.” See Nichol, *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, 7:851; cf. Stefanovic, *Revelation of Jesus Christ*, 515).

<sup>33</sup>Each of the seven empires challenged God in some way. Pharaoh asked Moses, “Who is the Lord, that I should obey His voice to let Israel go?” (Exod 5:2). The Assyrian king Sennacherib besieged Jerusalem and challenged the Lord, stating that Yahweh could not deliver Judah from his hands (2 Kgs 18:13, 30-35). Nebuchadnezzar threatened the Jews, saying, “Who is the god who will deliver you from my hands?” (Dan 3:15). In Persia, Haman wanted to exterminate the Jews (Esther 3:8). The Seleucid Antiochus killed Jews and desecrated the temple. Rome crucified Christ and destroyed Jerusalem. About papal Rome, it be would asked, “Who is like the beast?” (Rev 13:4). In turn, the two-horned beast causes the earth and its inhabitants to worship the first beast (13:12) and condemns to death those who do not do it (13:15).

<sup>34</sup>Robert L. Thomas, *Revelation 8-22: An Exegetical Commentary* (Chicago, IL: Moody

happened to Egypt and Persia. But, for all of them, there is a crucial moment in which they act to benefit the dragon's cause: this is when a head rises up.

### *Parallel Visions*

By interpreting Revelation, one must take into account the distinctive feature of apocalyptic prophecy that is the description of parallel, complementary, and interdependent visions.<sup>35</sup> William Johnsson says that parallel visions “recapitulate and expand the subject matter already given,” adding “details not present in the previous account”.<sup>36</sup> In the case of Daniel, chapters 2, 7 and 8 describe the same powers by using different pictures and approaches. Ekkehardt Mueller states that both Daniel and Revelation use the “principle of recapitulation,” by which different visions “cover basically the same historical period but each from a different perspective and with different emphases.”<sup>37</sup>

LaRondelle states that the seven heads and ten horns of the symbolic monsters of Revelation establish distinct parallels among those views. He observes that three times (Rev 12, 13, and 17) “a symbolic beast” with seven heads and ten horns is displayed.<sup>38</sup> “This beast [Rev 17] also has the significant feature of the seven heads and ten horns (v. 3), closely related to the red dragon of chapter 12.”<sup>39</sup>

When Rev 12, 13, and 17 are placed in parallel, for the entities represented by the dragon and the beasts, we have the following configuration:

*Revelation 12:* The dragon pursues the pure woman and Christ (v. 4); in this case he represents imperial Rome. However, he also pursues the woman for 1,260 years (12:6, 14); thus he also represents papal Rome. Finally, he still pursues the remnant, who keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus (12:17); thus, he also represents the same entity portrayed by the two-horned beast

---

Press, 1995), 292.

<sup>35</sup>See William Johnsson, “Biblical Apocalyptic,” in *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, ed. Raoul Dederen (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2000), 799; Nichol, *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, 7:110, 111, 123, 788, 818.

<sup>36</sup>Johnsson, “Biblical Apocalyptic,” 799.

<sup>37</sup>Ekkehardt Mueller and Gernard Pfandl, “How do Seventh-day Adventists Interpret Daniel and Revelation,” in *Interpreting Scripture: Bible Questions and Answers*, ed. Gerhard Pfandl (Hagerstown, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 2010), 87.

<sup>38</sup>Hans K. LaRondelle, “Babylon: Anti-Christian Empire,” in *Symposium on Revelation: Introductory and Exegetical Studies*, book 2, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Springs, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 1992), 177.

<sup>39</sup>Hans K. LaRondelle, “Armageddon: Sixth and Seventh Plagues,” in *Symposium on Revelation: Introductory and Exegetical Studies*, book 2, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Springs, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 1992), 376.



(13:15-17). But he has seven crowns in his heads (Rev 12:3), which point to seven political powers. In this way, the old ones are represented in this vision.

*Revelation 13:* The leopard-like beast gets the throne from the dragon (13:2), that is, he succeeds imperial Rome and persecutes the saints for 1,260 years (or 42 months, 13:5); thus, he represents papal Rome. In turn, his ally, the two-horned beast emerges from the “earth” (13:11), the same place where the pure woman went out after the 1,260 years of persecution (12:16). Thus, this earth beast represents a political power in the New World, where a group of faithful Christians took refuge in the early 17th century. The earth beast pursues those who do not have the mark of the beast and, therefore, keep the commandments of God. In doing that, he represents the same entity already portrayed in the dragon’s actions against the remnant (12:17).<sup>40</sup>

*Revelation 17:* The scarlet beast has seven heads that are seven kings (vv. 9-10). The angel says that five of them had fallen (Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Persia, and Greece) and one existed in John’s time, that is, imperial Rome. Besides that, the seventh one would come, that is, papal Rome. However, the beast is also an eighth (v. 8), an ultimate power of the same nature of the previous seven, on which the harlot would be mounted in the final crisis. Being the last temporal power to support the harlot, this eighth king can represent the same power in war against the remnant that was first portrayed by the dragon in Rev 12:17 and the two-horned beast (13:11), which restores and supports the first beast in the final crisis.

In this viewpoint, the “mystery” (Rev 17:7) of the beast that has seven heads that are seven/eighth sequential kings in war against God’s people is already suggested in Rev 12 and 13. The parallel among those kings would be as follow (see **Table 1**):

<b>Table 1: Parallels Between the Kings of Revelation 12, 13, and 17</b>			
	<i>Imperial Rome</i>	<i>Papal Rome</i>	<i>A Last Empire</i>
<b>Rev 12: Dragon</b>	v. 4 Crucifies Christ	vv. 6, 13, 14 Persecutes the church for 1,260 years	v. 17 Persecutes the remnant
<b>Rev 13: Beast + 2nd Beast</b>	v. 2 Occupies the same throne of	vv. 2, 5 Persecutes the church 1,260 years	vv. 11-18 Persecutes those who don’t have the

<sup>40</sup>It is clear that keeping the commandments is the reason for the persecution by the two beasts against the saints in Rev 13 by the verbal parallel between Rev 13:10, “Here is the patience and the faith of the saints”, and 14:12, “Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.”

	the dragon		mark of the beast
<b>Rev 17: Beast + 8th king</b>	v. 10 Existed in John's time	v. 10 King that would come in future	v. 11 Persecutes the elect and faithful

Besides this above parallel that makes important suggestions about the identity of the kings, the relation of the harlot's judgment to the sixth plague sheds additional light on Rev 17 by allowing a wider exploration of the entities symbolized by the woman and the scarlet beast. During this plague, the world appears completely polarized between the enemies of God and the remnant. The enemies are the coalition of religious powers represented by the dragon, beast, and false prophet (Rev 16:13) and the political and military powers represented by the "kings of the earth" (16:14). At Armageddon, the remnant consists of whom "watches and keeps" to walk uprightly before God (16:15).

Those two groups are represented several times in Revelation, but most clearly at the final crisis described in Rev 13 and 16–17. In chapter 13, the enemy group is represented by two symbols: the first beast, healed of his deadly wound, and the two-horned beast (see 13:11–17). In Rev 17, the same group is represented by two other symbols: the harlot and the scarlet beast along with the "ten kings." From chapter 13 to 16 and 17, there is a change in which the entity represented by the first beast becomes a religious power and expands to incorporate "Spiritualism" and "Protestantism,"<sup>41</sup> as suggested in Rev 16:13, in order to become Babylon (17:5). In turn, the two-horned beast goes forth to incorporate "the kings of the earth" (16:14; 17:12, 16). This expansion in the description of the entities justifies the change in the symbols.<sup>42</sup> Therefore, the beast whose mortal wound was healed (religious power; in Rev 13:12) would be parallel to the harlot in Rev 17, and the two-horned beast (political power; in Rev 13:11) would be parallel to the eighth king.

Thus, considering the common context of the final crisis in Rev 12–13 and Armageddon in Rev 16–17, where the enemies of God assume this political and religious configuration, these visions may be put in parallel. The first beast represents the same entity as the harlot, and the two-horned beast represents the same entity as the eighth king, as following (see **Table 2**):

<sup>41</sup>See Paulien, *Armageddon at the Door*, 160–165, 173; cf. Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 1980), 588, 589.

<sup>42</sup>Such changes to symbols are common in apocalyptic prophecy when the spectrum of the revelation is expanded or changed. In Dan 2, a sequence of empires (Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome, and papal Rome) is represented by a statue of gold, silver, bronze, iron, and clay. The same sequence of empires is represented in Dan 7 by four beasts. In Dan 8, the symbols change again and the last three powers are represented by a ram, a goat, and a "little horn."

**Table 2: Parallels Between the Religious and Political Powers of Revelation 13–17**

	<i>Religious Powers</i>	<i>Political Powers</i>
<b>Rev 13:11–17:8</b> <b>Final Crisis</b>	Restored first beast	Two-horned beast & the Earth and its inhabitants
<b>Rev 16:12-16</b> <b>Armageddon</b>	Dragon, beast, and false prophet	Kings of the earth
<b>Rev 17:12-15</b> <b>The Last Battle</b>	Harlot	Scarlet beast: Eighth king & ten kings

The apocalyptic symbols seem to be used in a consistent way to represent religious forces and political and military powers: animals or beasts represent secular powers, and animals with human characteristics or persons represent religious powers. In Dan 7, the animals that represent the political powers of Babylon, Persia, and Greece do not have human characteristics, but the little horn of the fourth beast, which represents the political-religious power of the popes, has “eyes like the eyes of a man” and “a mouth speaking” (Dan 7:8). In Revelation, the beast symbolizing papal Rome has a mouth that speaks “blasphemy against God” (Rev 13:6). The second beast, symbolizing American political power, has no human characteristics. In Rev 17, a woman represents the religious power, but the scarlet beast that displays nothing human represents the political and military powers. Thus, as a symbol, the beast represents a religious power only in the historical period alluded in Rev 13:1-10, when the same entity incorporates both religious and political powers.

The parallels between the visions in Rev 13 and 16–17 allow to expand the relation between the eighth king and the two-horned beast. The scarlet beast “carries” (17:7; Gr. *bastazō*, “take”, “bear”) the harlot, who is “sitting” on him (v. 3). The two-horned beast makes an image of the first beast and restores his wound (Rev 13:14): that is, the second beast places himself in the service of the first one. The scarlet beast, which is also the eighth king (17:11), leads the “ten kings” (modern nations; multifold peoples) against the Lamb at the final battle (17:14). The two-horned beast leads those who “dwell on the earth” (13:14) and the “kings of the earth” (16:14) against God and His people at Armageddon. Thus, both scenarios predict a “grand coalition” of secular powers, to be led by the two-horned beast according to Rev 13, and by the scarlet beast in the eighth king phase according to Rev 17.

On the other hand, the climax of the conflict described in Rev 13:11-17 would not be possible without the role performed by the two-horned beast. He restores the power of the first beast, makes an image of him, and imposes his laws over the earth. If the final crisis is started by the emergence of the two-horned beast in

Rev 13, he really should be seen in the scenario of the final crisis described in Rev 17.

The angel further states that the scarlet beast (political and military power), supported by the ten kings, destroys the harlot (religious power; Rev 17:16). At the eschatological climax, the final proclamation of the 'Three Angels' Messages (Rev 14:6-10) by the remnant will unmask the harlot and contribute to her subsequent fall during the sixth plague. The "waters" that "dry up" (see 17:15; 16:12) point to the withdrawal of the support of the nations (13:14; 16:14; 17:12, 13). Thus, the nations that previously united in favor of Babylon not only cease to support her, but hate and destroy her (17:16).<sup>43</sup> Among the nations seduced by the harlot, the strongest is the one represented by the two-horned beast.

It should also be noted that the description of a seven-headed beast plus an eighth king in Rev 17 allows an even clearer parallel with Rev 13, where John also describes eight elements: a seven-headed beast plus a two-horned beast. Considering the essential role of the two-horned beast in the final crisis, it makes sense that he should be mentioned in Rev 17, which focuses on the end times. Since that entity is not represented by one of the seven heads of the first beast in Rev 13, it also makes sense that in Rev 17 this power is represented as an *eighth*, or an addendum to the sequence of the previous seven, distinguished from them.

On the other hand, what will make the United States a persecuting power in the final crisis is the fact that this nation will reproduce a characteristic of the beast's seventh head, which is the only earthly power formed by the union of church and state. Thus, when the United States formalizes a union of the (Protestant) church with the (Republican) state, it will have reproduced the "image of the beast" (Rev 13:14) in this Protestant nation.<sup>44</sup> After that, this beast begins to "speak" like a dragon, by acquiring a human characteristic.

Although Stefanovic interprets the eighth king as the resurgence of medieval political power of the papacy in the end times, he sees the two-horned beast of Rev 13 as the key power in the final crisis. He says, "What the second half of Rev 13 seems to suggest is that the medieval authority of the first beast once again will be exercised [but] through the earth beast." He adds, "The earth beast will even replace the first beast in universal power and authority and will act as the end-time worldwide oppressive power."<sup>45</sup> In the final crisis, "the earth beast comes to

<sup>43</sup>The wrath of God upon the harlot will be executed through her own allies, which are also enemies of God. God used ancient Babylon to execute His judgment upon Judah (2 Kgs 24:1-20; Jer 20:4), and Persia to get revenge on Babylon (Isa 13:19, 34:14).

<sup>44</sup>Ellen White explains that the union of church and state will lead the United States to form an image of the beast. "When the leading churches of the United States, uniting upon such points of doctrine as are held by them in common, shall influence the state to enforce their decrees and to sustain their institutions, then Protestant America will have formed an image of the Roman hierarchy." See White, *The Great Controversy*, 445.

<sup>45</sup>Stefanovic, *Revelation of Jesus Christ*, 423.

exercise the same intolerance and force that characterized the sea beast during the Middle Ages”.<sup>46</sup> Thus, in Stefanovic’s perspective, the political power to act in the final crisis like the medieval papacy is that one represented by the two-horned beast of Rev 13, resting no other choice unless seeing the two-horned beast as a parallel power to the eighth king which is the oppressive power in the final crisis according to Rev 17.

In this viewpoint, the power of the United States in the final crisis can be adequately described as a successor of the seventh head or a resurrection of the beast. The eighth will not be a distinct one from the seventh head of the beast but an offshoot of him. This relation between the eighth king and the seventh one can justify the expression that the eighth “is of the seven” or “proceeds” from them (Rev 17:11, KJV). Curiously, John describes the two-horned beast as an *allon therion* of the first one, that is, other beast of the same nature (Rev 13:11).

Finally, John says that the entity represented by the two-horned beast “exercises all the authority of the first beast in his presence, and causes the earth and those who dwell in it to worship the first beast” (Rev 13:12). Thus, cooperation between the two supposed last kings was already established in Rev 13. This union is represented in Rev 13 by the cooperation between the two-horned beast and the first beast, and in Rev 17 by the woman (church) who sat on the beast (state).

### *Conclusions*

The visions related in Rev 17 and 18 can be seen as further explanatory revelations about the sixth plague and the fall of the mystical Babylon. There is a sequence of judgment (Rev 17) followed by execution of sentence (Rev. 18). The harlot and the scarlet beast seem to represent different entities within the group of God’s enemies at the eschatological climax.

Since the heads of the scarlet beast of Rev 17 represent seven kings/world temporal empires (Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome, and papal Rome), the eighth may be the American imperial power, as represented by the two-horned beast in Rev 13:11. In this case, the “eighth king” would be the last empire to exercise power over God’s people.<sup>47</sup>

This relation between the eighth king and the two-horned beast does not discard the relation between the eighth king and Satan, but it seeks to specify how and through whom the dragon shall act at the final crisis. This hypothesis is

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., 424.

<sup>47</sup>About the development of the Seventh-day Adventist interpretation of Rev 13:11, see Uriah Smith, *The United States in the Light of Prophecy; or, An Exposition of Rev. xiii, 11-17* (Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Pub. Assn., 1876); L. A. Smith, *The United States in Prophecy* (Nashville, TN: Southern Pub. Assn., 1914). See also Vanderlei Dorneles, *The Last Empire* (Tatuí, SP: CPB, 2015), 33-52.

consistent with the way Scripture identifies the kings/empires with the dragon symbol. In Exodus, Egypt is the *drakōn* that God crushed on the waters (LXX, Ps 74:13, 14; Isa 51:9; Eze 29:3; 32:2). Babylon is the *drakōn* that crushed Israel (LXX, Jer 51:34). Pagan Rome is represented by the figure of the *drakōn* (Rev 12:3, 9). Papal Rome receives the power and throne of the *drakōn* (Rev 13:2), and the two-horned beast speaks like the *drakōn* (Rev 13:11).

This hypothesis is also consistent with the context of Rev 17. John says that the beast and his aliens (ten horns) will hate the harlot and destroy her (v. 16).<sup>48</sup> If the beast and the ten horns/kings are seen as the political powers that are deceived by the religious power in the end time, it would be coherent with the preview that the beast and the ten kings will destroy the religious power that deceived them. This would be the effect of the sixth plague which is being explained in Rev 17 and 18.<sup>49</sup>

The structural similarities among the scarlet beast, the red dragon, and the leopard-like beast suggest that Satan is the power behind all the empires that have opposed God and His people. The parallels among the visions of the eschatological climax described in Rev 12, 13, 16 and 17 favor the comparison between the first beast and the harlot as well as between the two-horned beast and the eighth king. Thus, the eighth king may be seen as a political and military eschatological imperial power succeeding the previous seven in their task to support and carry the harlot.

<sup>48</sup>The reading “and the ten horns which you saw on the beast, these will hate the harlot” (NKJV) is not consistent with the context because vv. 12, 13 say that the ten kings have no power without the beast. They exercise their role with and through the beast. Thus the reading “beast and the ten horns you saw will hate the prostitute” (NIV) is more clear in the light of the previous description about the relationship among the kings and the beast.

<sup>49</sup>Ellen G. White says that the enemies of God’s people will be near to destroy them in the final time of probation. But, finally, they will use their weapons to destroy their spiritual leaders (religious power). Presumably, she is describing the effect of the sixth plague because that will happen after the close of intercession and before the second coming of Jesus (see White, *The Great Controversy*, 637, 639, 640, 655, 656).



## **ELLEN G. WHITE'S UNDERSTANDING OF INDWELLING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT: A CHRONOLOGICAL STUDY**

CORY WETTERLIN

Ph.D. Candidate in Systematic Theology (Andrews University)  
wetterli@andrews.edu

### *Abstract*

Throughout history there have been two major understandings of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. The first is the indwelling of the transcendent timeless God within the timeless soul of a body/soul, dualistic anthropology. The second is an all-inclusive view in which either everything is God, pantheism, or everything is within God, panentheism. Adventism has traditionally rejected both of these understandings. Adventism teaches a monistic anthropology, denying the indwelling of the soul and a panentheistic point of view. How then is Adventism able to define the indwelling of the Holy Spirit? In order to begin to answer this question it seems fitting to study the prophetic voice of the Adventist church and come to at least an initial interpretation of Ellen White's understanding of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. In this article an initial understanding of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit will be presented through a limited in-depth chronological study of four significant sources of the writings of Ellen White, rather than a surface study of her entire works. These are excerpts from *Steps to Christ*, "Growing Up Into Christ" (chapter 8), a letter written to Sister Wessels, Sr., referenced in *Special Testimonies to Ministers and Gospel Workers*, Series A No. 9 pg. 75-80, *Desire of Ages*, "Let Not Your Heart Be Troubled" (chapter 73), and *Testimonies for the Church*, Vol. 8 section 5. The results of this study show White's understanding of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit as an abiding in Christ through a devotional interpersonal relationship of faith demonstrated most clearly in transformation of character for the Christian believer.

Keywords: spirituality; Ellen G. White; panentheism; indwelling; Christian life; sanctification.

### *Introduction*

The indwelling of the Holy Spirit in theological systems is related to the discussion of the balance between the transcendence and the immanence of God. There are those who emphasize the transcendence of God and those who emphasize the immanence of God and their understandings of indwelling are affected by these



emphases.<sup>1</sup> The transcendent emphasis is based on an ontological dualism derived from the philosophy of Plato. When Ambrose, Augustine, and others brought this philosophy into Christianity it was presupposed that humanity had both the material body and the immortal soul as part of a dual ontology. Indwelling in this understanding is an ontological indwelling within the soul.<sup>2</sup> According to this transcendent emphasis the soul is part of the world of ideas, or the timeless realm of God while the body is part of the material world. God cannot interact with the temporal material world and therefore can only indwell a human in the timeless part of them, the soul. This view is still prominent today in most of western Christianity as a part of classic theism.

The immanent indwelling emphasis also claims its beginnings in Greek philosophy.<sup>3</sup> Plato's ultimate reality, the good, is a part of every living thing,

<sup>1</sup>"Conceptions of the divine presence in the world have varied, as much as the very conceptions of God. One religion has differed from the other in this regard. Even within Christianity itself we find considerable disagreement as to the nature of God's omnipresence and as to what degree He is related to the world and to man in particular. While the Christian Greek tradition of the early Church held to the belief in an immanent God, Latin theology eventually put the stress on the transcendence of God. Reformation theology subsequently gave added emphasis to divine transcendence and marked a further step in the West's departure from the spirit of the ancient Church." See Eusebius A. Stephanou, "Divine Indwelling in the World," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 4, no. 2 (1959): 135. John Cooper also describes the differences in classical theology and the immanent panentheistic theology in the introduction to his book. See John W. Cooper, *Panentheism, the Other God of the Philosophers: From Plato to the Present* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2006), 18, 19.

<sup>2</sup>Gleason clearly takes this view and supports it with numerous church fathers in the introduction and first chapter of his book. Gleason clearly claims the Holy Spirit as a substantial ontological presence indwelling the soul, which is initiated at baptism. See Robert W. Gleason, *The Indwelling Spirit* (Staten Island, NY: Alba, 1966), 5–9. This classical theological understanding is largely built on the understanding that is derived and debated upon based on the writing of Thomas Aquinas. The indwelling of the Spirit in the just soul is a new type of union with divine presence from general divine presence with all of creation through which the believer possesses the entire trinity through knowledge and love. The primary person of the trinity involved is the Holy Spirit and through this possession the believer may then enjoy the divine presence in the sense of sanctification or transformation of life. See Francis L. B. Cunningham, *The Indwelling of the Trinity; a Historico-Doctrinal Study of the Theory of St. Thomas Aquinas* (Dubuque, IA: Priory, 1955); Barthelmy Froget, *The Indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Souls of the Just: According to the Teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas*, trans. Sydney A. Raemers, Translated from the 3rd French ed. (Westminster, MD: Newman, 1952).

<sup>3</sup>"The ancient Greeks were fond of the idea that the divine existed in close proximity to the world. In their mythology gods and men mingle freely. The affinity between the divine and the human was a popular feeling both in mythology and in philosophy." See Stephanou, "Indwelling," 137.

therefore when adapted to Christianity the *imago Dei* is a part of every being. God is in all and all is in God for all has a part of the good. In the same way Aristotle's unmoved mover is perfect actuality and all things have some actuality, therefore God is in all and all is in God.<sup>4</sup> Indwelling in the immanent emphasis, is an all-pervasive infusion of the presence of God in all things.<sup>5</sup> Immanence has been a part of the eastern system of Christianity all along, but has now entered the western mindset as well through process theology and panentheism. Panentheism says that all is in God and yet God is beyond all, the dualistic comparison is one of God as the soul of the cosmic body. In other words the cosmos is the material body of God and God is the all pervasive soul which holds the cosmos together both within and beyond the cosmos.<sup>6</sup>

Process theologian, John B. Cobb, redefines reality as energy-events building upon each other. In this new understanding of reality the cosmos as a part of God's being is mutually indwelt in a co-constitution of being through participation in the experience of God.<sup>7</sup> Each present energy-event is building on the energy-

<sup>4</sup>"There is always the risk of overstating the transcendence of God in the theology of Aristotle. Since all things, according to this philosopher, are drawn to the final cause, which is God, we must remember that He must be in all beings, as their immanent essence (τάξις), as well as above the things and apart from the world (ξεχωρισμένον τι και αυτό καθ' αυτό)." See Stephanou, "Indwelling," 138. Cooper draws the philosophical origins of an immanent panentheistic emphasis most clearly from Plotinus arguing that Plato keep the original divine creator separate from the World-soul. Plotinus' chain of being as one thing emanates from the next only to be within and return to the divine "one" is what Cooper calls classic Panentheism. See Cooper, *Panentheism*, 38, 41, 43.

<sup>5</sup>Stephanou, "Indwelling," 139.

<sup>6</sup>Both John B. Cobb and Stephanou build their system based on a God as the soul of the world idea, both using the incarnation of the Logos as the basis for this. The tie between current eastern orthodox and process is quite strong. "The character of the world is influenced by God, but it is not determined by him, and the world in its turn contributes novelty and richness to the divine experience. The doctrine that I am developing here is a form of 'panen-theism.' It is, in my understanding, a type of theism. But it differs from much traditional theism insofar as the latter stressed the mutual externality of God and the world, with God conceived as occupying another supernatural, sphere. It differs from pantheism when pantheism is understood to be the identification of God and the world. The doctrine that I am developing here is a form of 'en-theism.' It is, in my understanding, a type of theism. But it differs from much traditional theism insofar as the latter stressed the mutual externality of God and the world, with God conceived as occupying another, supernatural, sphere. It differs from pantheism when pantheism is understood to be the identification of God and the world. Yet, in reality, panentheism is the synthesis of the central concerns of traditional theism and pantheism." See John B. Cobb, *God and the World* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969), 79, 80.

<sup>7</sup>"Process philosophy, especially as Alfred North Whitehead developed it, gives primacy to relations. It shows that real entities do 'indwell' or 'participate in' one another.

events of the past and because reality is built out of energy-events all ontology of the cosmos is connected with the ontology of God.<sup>8</sup> Panentheism is an immanent system of mutual indwelling built upon a new construction of reality.

The historical balancing act of transcendence and immanence concerning the indwelling of the divine presence has entered Adventism as well. Adventism rejected the idea of the immortal soul separate from the body, therefore the Holy Spirit could not dwell in the soul in the same way as for classic theists. This offered confusion at the time of John Harvey Kellogg who chose the immanent option instead. Previously chastised for his mechanistic view of God and nature removing God to a deistic transcendence, Kellogg sought for another option. He discovered that God, instead of being completely removed, could rather be in all of creation and all of creation could be in God.<sup>9</sup> Kellogg seems to have distanced himself from the pantheistic understanding that all is God, which was his first impulse for trying to adjust his transcendent view. He instead went to the panentheistic view, God is in all and all is in God.<sup>10</sup> Ellen White and other Adventist church leaders reproved these views of Kellogg and called for something different.<sup>11</sup>

---

The real entities in question are ‘occasions of experience.’ A present human experience includes past occasions within itself, selectively, but genuinely, as well as events in the environment.” See John B. Cobb and David John Lull, *Romans*, Chalice Commentaries for Today (St. Louis, MO: Chalice, 2005), 92, 93.

<sup>8</sup>“The electron can only be understood as a succession of events or happenings. These events can be viewed as transmissions of energy from past events to future ones. If we ask what they are in themselves, the only answer possible to the physicist is energy. The building blocks of the universe, the things of which everything else is composed, are energy-events...It would be truer to say that what is physical in the naive sense is the by-product of the interaction of energy-events outside the body with those that constitute the sense organs. That God is not in this way by no means reduces his actuality. When we conceive the physical as composed of certain types or aspects of energy-events rather than in the naive way.” See Cobb, *God/World*, 70.

<sup>9</sup>Brian C. Wilson, *Dr. John Harvey Kellogg and the Religion of Biologic Living* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press), 71.

<sup>10</sup>While most at the time considered Kellogg to be a pantheist rather than a panentheist, Kellogg’s view is more in line with the panentheism, which is developed by John Cobb. Cobb uses the same idea that God is in all and all is in God. See Cobb, *God/World*, 78-80; John B. Cobb, *Christ in a Pluralistic Age* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975). This is reflected in Wilson’s work as well. See Wilson, *Dr. John Harvey Kellogg*, 72.

<sup>11</sup>Wilson, *Dr. John Harvey Kellogg*, 77. In other unpublished documents available from the white estate, Pittack made the argument that Kellogg’s pantheism makes God ultimately responsible for sin, which Daniels rejects. See Richard Bruce Pittack, “The Pantheistic Crisis in S.D.A. History” (Class Paper for CH570-2 History of SDA Church, Center for Adventist Research, Andrews University, June 1972), 17. This rejection is also supported by Jacquelyn E. Ruskjer, “Pantheism in Kellogg’s the Living Temple: Fact or

Adventists have rejected the immortality of the soul, which provides for classical theism's transcendent emphasis of indwelling. They have also rejected the pantheistic immanent emphasis embraced by Kellogg. This then raises the question, how then do Adventists define the indwelling of the Holy Spirit? How does Ellen White define indwelling? This research seeks to discern an Adventist definition of 'indwelling' based on contents from Ellen White's discourse.

This study will chronologically process four major passages from the writings of Ellen White. Each passage will be analyzed for the definition it provides of indwelling; the passages will then be compared to see if there is a development of thought. The information from each passage will then be compiled to determine a fuller definition of indwelling.

### *Analysis of Four Passages on Indwelling*

I will process and analyze each selected section of text, identifying the markers, which will build a system of Ellen White's understanding of indwelling. As I come to the conclusion of each passage I will summarize what I have found and give a brief comparison to what has come before it chronologically in the other passages.

#### "Growing Up Into Christ" in *Steps to Christ* (1892)

*Steps to Christ* was written at the suggestion of some evangelists as a resource for explaining the basics of salvation and spiritual growth.<sup>12</sup> At the suggestion of having smaller books more available for general consumption, White went to work with her literary assistant Marian Davis to gather both published and unpublished writings on "one of her favorite topics... about the steps sinners must take in finding their way to Christ."<sup>13</sup> The book was produced in the summer of 1891 and presented to a group of ministers and teachers in Harbor Heights, MI who welcomed it and the name of *Steps to Christ* was chosen.<sup>14</sup> The book was first published by a nondenominational press for hope of wider readership and then later transferred to the Review and Herald for publication.<sup>15</sup>

In his dissertation, Woodrow W. Whidden, wrote a theological biography of White concerning her personal journey of Salvation She made a very similar -

---

Fable?" (Class Paper, HIST/RELH 585, Loma Linda University, 1985), 4, and Stanley August Aufdemberg, "John Harvey Kellogg and Pantheism" (Class Paper, History of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, Andrews University, 1970).

<sup>12</sup>Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White: The Australian Years, 1891-1900*, vol. 4 (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1985) 12.

<sup>13</sup>Herbert E. Douglass, *Messenger of the Lord: The Prophetic Ministry of Ellen G. White* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 1998), 445.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*, 445.

<sup>15</sup>*Ibid.*

journey to John Wesley as she struggled to find salvation. She first longed for the initial forgiveness of justification followed by a great longing for full sanctification, a life without sin.<sup>16</sup> She was not so naïve to think that perfection could be reached before the return of Jesus. She encountered and spoke against many fanatical holiness groups who engaged in such beliefs and the immoral practices that followed believers who claimed their desires were now holy.<sup>17</sup> White's personal salvation journey combined with the General Conference debate over righteousness by faith in 1888, might serve as a strong motivation for the writing of *Steps to Christ* in addition to the evangelistic purpose.

Chapter 8 in *Steps to Christ* (published in 1892) is entitled "Growing up in Christ." In this chapter Ellen White develops what it means to grow in spiritual maturity in Christ. There are several concepts that she brings to light in this chapter, which allow for this growth to happen. I will state the concepts here and then develop them as this section continues. First, spiritual growth is only possible in Christ. Second, in order to grow a believer must consecrate him or herself to Christ. Third, the whole process of growth is accomplished by the means of faith. Fourth, when a believer "dwells on" Christ instead of self they will be transformed in character. Finally, with the transformation of the character the continual abiding of the Holy Spirit is realized in the hearts of the believers. The analysis of this first text will consist of working through these concepts as they build to White's general statement of indwelling at the end of the chapter

Spiritual growth happens in the context of abiding in Christ. White defines abiding in Christ as being "dependent upon Christ, in order to live a holy life."<sup>18</sup> She is very clear that without Christ it is not possible for a person to grow in Christ. Abiding is a union with Christ made through daily, even hourly, communion with Christ. Abiding is only possible through faith. The believer is to

<sup>16</sup>Woodrow W. Whidden, "The Soteriology of Ellen G. White: The Persistent Path to Perfection, 1836-1902" (Dissertation, Drew University, 1989), 18-49.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., 53-57, 76-82.

<sup>18</sup>"Jesus teaches the same thing when He says, 'Abide in Me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in Me. . . . Without Me ye can do nothing.' John 15:4, 5. You are just as dependent upon Christ, in order to live a holy life, as is the branch upon the parent stock for growth and fruitfulness. Apart from Him you have no life. You have no power to resist temptation or to grow in grace and holiness. Abiding in Him, you may flourish. Drawing your life from Him, you will not wither nor be fruitless. You will be like a tree planted by the rivers of water." See Ellen G. White, *Steps to Christ* (New York et al: Revell, 1892), 68, 69.

consecrate themselves to God in a "Day by day" giving of their lives "into the hands of God."<sup>19</sup>

Faith is further defined as turning one's focus from the self towards Christ, instead: "Let the mind dwell upon His love, upon the beauty, the perfection of His character. Christ in His self-denial, Christ in His humiliation, Christ in His purity and holiness, Christ in His matchless love –this is the subject for the soul's contemplation."<sup>20</sup> The believer must realize that he or she is powerless to accomplish anything on his or her own. It is only by "dwelling on" Christ rather than self that the believer can gain the union with Christ, which brings victory.<sup>21</sup> The recognition of total dependence upon Christ is the life of faith; according to White, the way in which one grows in Christ is the same as at the beginning of a relationship with Christ: "as you received Him at first...the just shall live by faith."<sup>22</sup>

The goal of this abiding in Christ by faith is the transformation of the character. The transformation of character is brought about by the "regenerating influence of the Holy Spirit" in the renewed heart.<sup>23</sup> The heart is the source of thoughts and desires, which are now renewed, in line with God's thoughts and desires.

The renewing work of the Spirit culminates in the general statements about the indwelling of the Spirit at the conclusion of the chapter. White says that Jesus' ascension was necessary so that in some way the presence of Christ through the Spirit is now closer to the disciples than it was while Jesus was on this earth. She ties this dwelling with the idea of Christ through the Spirit abiding "continually in the hearts of His children."<sup>24</sup> White describes a union made between the believer and Christ in the same way that there was a union between the Son and the Father. She wraps up the chapter by suggesting, that in "loving Him and abiding in Him, we shall 'grow up into Him in all things, which is the head, even Christ.'"<sup>25</sup>

In this chapter the indwelling of the Spirit is tied to the concept of an abiding union of the believer with Christ. This union is accomplished by faith through the consecration of the heart and mind to the activity of "dwelling on" Christ rather than the self. It is through this devotional dwelling that a transformation of

<sup>19</sup>"Without Me ye can do nothing.' Our growth in grace, our joy, our usefulness,--all depend upon our union with Christ. It is by communion with Him, daily, hourly,--by abiding in Him." See White, *Steps to Christ*, 69.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., 70.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., 70, 71.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., 71, 72.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., 70.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., 73.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., 75.

character takes place in the heart of the believer. White then directly connects this union to the Spirit of Christ who “shall be in you.”<sup>26</sup> These concepts set the tone for White’s understanding of indwelling, although this chapter does not differentiate between what indwelling is and is not, especially concerning ontological questions. The ontological context of indwelling is left for later discussions.

### Letter to Sister Wessels (1896)

The Wessels family was a wealthy family in South Africa, which Ellen White contacted several times in her efforts to support the development of Adventism in South Africa and Australia, including Avondale College. The Wessels family carried some folklore and scandal, along with the financial support of the Adventist work.<sup>27</sup> The history of the patriarch has been told with various degrees of truthfulness.<sup>28</sup>

From White’s actual letters one is able to guess what might have set up the circumstances for the particular letter being analyzed in this paper. While in Cooranbong, Australia on May 4, 1896, White writes a letter to Sister Wessels, Sr.,

<sup>26</sup>“And Pentecost brought them the presence of the Comforter, of whom Christ had said, He ‘shall be in you.’ And He had further said, ‘It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you.’ John 14:17; 16:7. Henceforth through the Spirit, Christ was to abide continually in the hearts of His children. Their union with Him was closer than when He was personally with them. The light, and love, and power of the indwelling Christ shone out through them, so that men, beholding, ‘marveled; and they took knowledge of them, that they had been with Jesus.’ Acts 4:13.” See White, *Steps to Christ*, 75.

<sup>27</sup>The folklore surrounds the story of Peter Wessel’s ignoring letters from White. His finances began to go under and one by one, he lost properties including a diamond mine, and he finally came to financial ruin. He lost his prized ranch and purchased a shack. When he moved in, he found the letters from White, he had left unopened. When he opened them he found the prediction of each of his failed business transactions. These letters however were not found and there were also historical errors, which would not allow for the story to be true. The details regarding this information were referenced in the following articles, which appeared in the *Review*. See Eugene F. Durand, “The Story of a Story,” *Adventist Review*, February 14, 1985, 15; Eugene F. Durand, “The Story of a Story-2,” *Adventist Review*, February 21, 1985, 18, 19; Eugene F. Durand, “The Story of a Story-3,” *Adventist Review*, March 14, 1985, 14, 15. The scandal was the sexual abuse charges which removed ministerial credentials from Peter Wessels. These details are referenced in a letter White wrote to Peter. See Ellen G. White to Peter Wessels, 1 June 1896, Lt 106, 1896, Center for Adventist Research, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

<sup>28</sup>See Durand, “The Story of a Story,” 15; Durand, “The Story of a Story-2,” 18, 19; Durand, “The Story of a Story-3,” 14, 15.

after coming to understand that she was suffering from “so depressed a spirit.”<sup>29</sup> The reasons are undisclosed for this depressed spirit. One suggested reason may be the difficulty of Sister Wessels’ children. White writes letters to more than one of the Wessels’ children encouraging them to get back onto the straight and narrow path.

The most striking letter related to the letter in this paper, is one to Peter Wessels, son of Sister Wessel, Sr. Peter Wessels has had a significant moral fall involving the students he has been teaching. The circumstances are severe enough that his credentials were removed. White rebukes Peter for adultery, tempting his students with the apples of Sodom, and awaking in them lustful desires, which the students will not be able to control.<sup>30</sup> This strong reference to child abuse and the loss of Peter’s credentials would be enough to break any mother’s heart.<sup>31</sup> White counsels Peter not to make a public confession of what has happened for the sake of the reputation of the ministry at large; she even includes his wife in the exclusion of the details.<sup>32</sup> It is unclear whether his mother would have known about the details or not, but all the same there are strong suggestions here for why Sister Wessels, Sr., might be depressed in spirit.

The letter to the son of Sister Wessels, Sr., is later published in the *Special Testimonies for Ministers and Workers* and includes some very clear statements for the understanding of indwelling.<sup>33</sup> White clearly stated that “Christ dwelling in our hearts by faith means the contemplation of Christ, beholding Christ, ever cherishing the dear Saviour as our very best and honored Friend, so that we would not in any action grieve and offend Him.”<sup>34</sup> This definition clearly continues the same concepts of abiding as seen in *Steps to Christ*. The same suggestion for the contemplation and beholding of Christ is given. Once again the contemplation is done by a means of faith.

White goes further in this letter than she did in the *Steps to Christ* passage. She uses temple language, “The church of Christ is represented as being builded for ‘an habitation of God through the Spirit.’ ... In the human heart cleansed from all moral impurity dwells the precious Saviour, ennobling, sanctifying the whole nature, and making the man a temple for the Holy Spirit.”<sup>35</sup> The temple imagery is

<sup>29</sup>White, *Steps to Christ*, 74.

<sup>30</sup>White to Wessels, 1 June 1896.

<sup>31</sup>White appeals to Peter to think of his Mother and references the need for the rest of the siblings to shape up as well. She also counsels Peter not to take the loss of credentials too hard as this was sure to happen from his actions, rather to focus on making himself right with God. See White to Wessels, 1 June 1896.

<sup>32</sup>White to Wessels, 1 June 1896.

<sup>33</sup>Ellen G. White, *Special Testimonies for Ministers and Workers*, No. 9 ([S.l.: s.n.], 1897).

<sup>34</sup>*Ibid.*, 75.

<sup>35</sup>*Ibid.*, 75, 76.



used to emphasize the divine presence tied together with the abiding nature of Christ dwelling in the hearts of humanity. She follows the temple imagery up with a comparison of Enoch's abiding relationship as he walked with God.<sup>36</sup> When White speaks about "divine companionship" she directly connects the dwelling of God among his people to their interaction with worship.<sup>37</sup>

The idea of dwelling on Christ is also strongly emphasized in this letter. White compares Christ to the sun and suggests that just as when a person looks at the sun and has the impression of the light of the sun implanted on everything he or she looks at so is it with Christ as the "Sun of Righteousness." When an individual focuses their gaze on Christ they will also see Him imprinted on everything they look at.<sup>38</sup> This dwelling on Christ once again, as in *Steps to Christ*, leads to the transformed character of the individual.

White adds an additional piece of clarification in this letter to what was written in *Steps to Christ*. She includes the importance of Jesus' words. When the words and instructions of Christ are received into one's life it is then that Jesus "is to us an abiding presence."<sup>39</sup> It is in this context that White makes her first ontological insinuation about the being of man. When the believer has accepted the words of Christ they become part of "the very texture of our entire being." White clearly states in conclusion that it is by his words that Christ dwells in humanity.<sup>40</sup> White

<sup>36</sup>Notice the added personal nature of these ideas tied with Enoch and therefore recommended for the personal consolation of sister Wessels. "We have the companionship of the divine presence, and as we realize this presence, our thoughts are brought into captivity to Jesus Christ. Our spiritual exercises are in accordance with the vividness of our sense of this companionship. Enoch walked with God in this way; and Christ is dwelling in our hearts by faith when we will consider what He is to us, and what a work He has wrought out for us in the plan of redemption. We shall be most happy in cultivating a sense of this great gift of God to our world and to us personally." See White, *Special Testimonies for Ministers and Workers*, No. 9, 76.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid.

<sup>38</sup>"I want to impress upon your mind that you may have a divine companion with you, if you will, always. 'And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? For ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people.'" See *ibid.*, 76, 77.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., 77.

<sup>40</sup>"When His words of instruction have been received, and have taken possession of us, Jesus is to us an abiding presence, controlling our thoughts and ideas and actions. We are imbued with the instruction of the greatest Teacher the world ever knew. A sense of human accountability and of human influence gives character to our views of life and of daily duties. Jesus Christ is everything to us--the first, the last, the best in everything. Jesus Christ, His Spirit, His character, colors everything; it is the warp and the woof, the very texture of our entire being. The words of Christ are spirit and life. We cannot, then, center our thoughts upon self; it is no more we that live, but Christ that liveth in us, and He is the hope of glory. Self is dead, but Christ is a living Saviour. Continuing to look unto

expands the concept of the transformed character clearly calling it the “result of an indwelling savior” in relation to the word of Christ “speaking to the soul.”<sup>41</sup>

The letter to Sister Wessels continues to build on the abiding or devotional nature of indwelling for Ellen White. She gave greater clarity by using the direct language of indwelling, the temple as the habitation of God, spiritual companionship, and bringing in the word of Christ as the means by which the living Savior indwells in the mind of the individual. The anthropological question of ontology is raised in this passage. How is it that the word of Christ becomes part of the “very being” of the believer? The context seems to suggest that this is once again done through the dwelling of the heart and mind on Christ that the imprint of Christ is then laid onto everything the believer is aware of.

“Let Not Your Heart Be Troubled” in *Desire of Ages* (1898)

*Desire of Ages* began in the 52 pages on “the life of Christ.”<sup>42</sup> Ellen White made entries about her writing on the “life of Christ” in her diary and letters. In his biography of White Arthur L. White mentioned several of these entries. She was in weak health during this time needing to constantly change positions. She set aside much of her other work to focus on the task of writing on the life of Christ, but felt the lack of work she was getting done due to the shortness of the days.<sup>43</sup> The major work of expansion from the “life of Christ” to the *Desire of Ages* was done in 1877 and 1878.<sup>44</sup> The final touches were not finished until 1898.<sup>45</sup>

---

Jesus, we reflect His image to all around us. We cannot stop to consider our disappointments, or even to talk of them; for a more pleasant picture attracts our sight--the precious love of Jesus. He dwells in us by the word of truth.” See White, *Special Testimonies for Ministers and Workers*, No. 9, 77, 78.

<sup>41</sup>She includes in this the Holy Spirit as the living water which is a spiritual power implanted within believers. In some way then even if the ontological being of God is not within humanity his power can still work within them. “Christ's gracious presence in His word is ever speaking to the soul, representing Him as the well of living water to refresh the thirsting soul. It is our privilege to have a living, abiding Saviour. He is the source of spiritual power implanted within us, and His influence will flow forth in words and actions, refreshing all within the sphere of our influence, begetting in them desires and aspirations for strength and purity, for holiness and peace, and for that joy which brings no sorrow with it. This is the result of an indwelling Saviour.” See *ibid.*, 78, 79.

<sup>42</sup>Arthur L. White, *Ellen White : Woman of Vision* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Pub. Association, 2000), 354.

<sup>43</sup>Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 4:95, 382.

<sup>44</sup>Arthur L. White, *Woman of Vision*, 354.

<sup>45</sup>*Ibid.*, 357.

One interesting statement- concerning the abiding work of the Holy Spirit is Whites' prayer that "the Holy Spirit may rest and abide upon" her.<sup>46</sup> She made such a request out of her own feelings of incapability.<sup>47</sup> Through this work of the Holy Spirit she received visions of certain scenes of the life of Christ.<sup>48</sup> During the expansion of the "life of Christ" into the *Desire of Ages* the work of the Holy Spirit in White's writing process expanded as well. The writing process then included the help of her assistant, Marian Davis. Means such as "Bible study, visions, prayer, meditation, discussion with her literary assistant, even 'hard thinking,' all under the general superintendence of the Holy Spirit, were involved in the writing."<sup>49</sup> Arthur White shared the research materials Ellen White was familiar with and the research process she and her assistant retained.<sup>50</sup> In essence all their efforts were guided by the Holy Spirit. In a statement written in 1904 Ellen White states her confidence in the work of the Holy Spirit in "tracing these truths upon my heart and mind as indelibly as the law was traced by the finger of God, upon the tables of stone, which are now in the ark."<sup>51</sup>

In a chapter of the *Desire of Ages*, White develops the understanding of the role of the Holy Spirit sent by Christ for the purpose of uniting believers with Christ in an abiding relationship. She discusses Christ's promise to the disciples in his prayer to the Father that he would send another Comforter who would abide with the believers forever; that he would dwell with them and in them.<sup>52</sup> White presents the Holy Spirit as Christ's representative, uninhibited by the constraints of the human body, for spatial reasons, therefore accessible to all of humanity, while Christ is limited by his human form.<sup>53</sup>

White also highlights the words of Christ in this passage and expands the understanding to include the role of the Holy Spirit regarding those words. The Spirit is to guide the believer to the full truth and understanding of the real meaning of Christ's words. The Spirit doesn't bring real meaning from previously unrevealed words but rather through the words of Christ in Scripture, "Through

<sup>46</sup>Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 4:95.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., 4:382.

<sup>48</sup>Arthur L. White, *Woman of Vision*, 357-358.

<sup>49</sup>Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 4:377.

<sup>50</sup>Marian assisted a great deal in gathering the previous writings of White. Anything, which brought greater clarity or significance to the point that White was trying to convey Marian would find and present to White. In this the various writing on the life of Christ was gathered and compiled into the final published volumes of the *Desire of Ages*. See Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 4:381.

<sup>51</sup>Arthur L. White, *Woman of Vision*, 358.

<sup>52</sup>White, *Special Testimonies for Ministers and Workers*, No. 9, 390.

<sup>53</sup>Ellen G. White, *The Desire of Ages* (Battle Creek, MI: Review and Herald, 1898), 668.

the Scripture the Holy Spirit speaks to the minds, and impresses truth upon the heart.”<sup>54</sup>

Transformation of character as the goal, comes out in this passage and is expanded to include the partaking of the divine nature. Through the Spirit a believer can become a partaker of the divine nature, which is directly tied to the impression of Christ's own character upon His church. The purpose of the impression of Christ's character on His church is for “the perfection of the character of His people.”<sup>55</sup> Once again White is bringing out transformation of character as the goal of an abiding relationship with Christ.

The idea of the individual's consecration to the ways and words of Christ is reemphasized in *Desire of Ages* by the insistence on the surrender of the soul to be guided by the Holy Spirit. Only through surrender can transformation occur. Those who do not submit seek to “manage themselves.”<sup>56</sup> This is similar to the “dwelling on” self rather than on Christ in chapter eight of *Steps to Christ*.

White builds on the concept of the union between Christ and believers in this chapter as well. She insists that the switch from Christ to the Holy Spirit would not change their union with Christ.<sup>57</sup> Even the means of faith in Christ as a personal Savior is the same for the union with the Holy Spirit as Christ's

<sup>54</sup>Ibid., 669.

<sup>55</sup>The divine nature seems to be directly tied to the transformation of the character. Once transformed, the character no longer has the hereditary or cultivated tendencies towards evil, which make up the human nature. “It is by the Spirit that the heart is made pure. Through the Spirit the believer becomes a partaker of the divine nature. Christ has given His Spirit as a divine power to overcome all hereditary and cultivated tendencies to evil, and to impress His own character upon His church. Of the Spirit Jesus said, ‘He shall glorify Me.’ The Saviour came to glorify the Father by the demonstration of His love; so the Spirit was to glorify Christ by revealing His grace to the world. The very image of God is to be reproduced in humanity. The honor of God, the honor of Christ, is involved in the perfection of the character of His people.” See *ibid.*, 671.

<sup>56</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>57</sup>The union in this statement begins with the possibility of the ontological union, but then returns to the cognitive union with the mind of Christ. “‘I am the Vine, ye are the branches,’ Christ said to His disciples. Though He was about to be removed from them, their spiritual union with Him was to be unchanged. The connection of the branch with the vine, He said, represents the relation you are to sustain to Me. The scion is engrafted into the living vine, and fiber by fiber, vein by vein, it grows into the vine stock. The life of the vine becomes the life of the branch. So the soul dead in trespasses and sins receives life through connection with Christ. By faith in Him as a personal Saviour the union is formed. The sinner unites his weakness to Christ's strength, his emptiness to Christ's fullness, his frailty to Christ's enduring might. Then he has the mind of Christ. The humanity of Christ has touched our humanity, and our humanity has touched divinity. Thus through the agency of the Holy Spirit man becomes a partaker of the divine nature. He is accepted in the Beloved.” See *ibid.*, 675.

representative.<sup>58</sup> This statement has interesting ontological implications. If the union has not changed, then to claim that through the Holy Spirit Christ is ontologically internal within the believer in a way in which He was not before must be discounted in White's view. White makes this point clear by explaining that the connection of the branch to the living vine is done through continual communion.<sup>59</sup> To emphasize, White points out that the words of Christ abide in the believer and makes the eating of Christ's flesh and blood simply representative of receiving the words of Christ.<sup>60</sup>

The work or the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in this chapter continued the abiding nature of the union with Christ. White promotes a word-based paradigm for understanding the abiding of Christ and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. She removes the possibility of a different type of union with the Holy Spirit than with Christ while he was here on earth. The only difference is in the limitations of Christ in His human form. Christ cannot be present in all places at all times as the Holy Spirit can. But the union with Christ remains the same through the surrender of the believer by faith to the words of Christ which the Holy Spirit communicates to the heart and mind by means of the scriptures.

*Testimonies for the Church*, Volume 8 (1904)

This text from the *Testimonies*, volume 8, section 5, specifically relating to pantheism and White's development of the "personal God" concept made an interesting shift compared to the previous three texts, which have been looked at so far. While in the previous three, White discussed what abiding in Christ and indwelling of the Holy Spirit means, in this text she spent much more time on what indwelling is not. There is a strong historical reason for this change of emphasis. The Adventist church had now gone through the Kellogg crisis that some have called Pantheism.<sup>61</sup> Kellogg began teaching his pantheistic ideas to the

<sup>58</sup>White, *The Desire of Ages*, 672.

<sup>59</sup>"This union with Christ, once formed, must be maintained. Christ said, 'Abide in Me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in Me.' This is no casual touch, no off-and-on connection. The branch becomes a part of the living vine. The communication of life, strength, and fruitfulness from the root to the branches is unobstructed and constant. Separated from the vine, the branch cannot live. No more, said Jesus, can you live apart from Me. The life you have received from Me can be preserved only by continual communion. Without Me you cannot overcome one sin, or resist one temptation." See *ibid.*, 675.

<sup>60</sup>*Ibid.*, 676. This of course is a significant difference from the transubstantial or even consubstantial nature of the Eucharist. There is no actual presence of Christ within the substance of the bread itself; it is simply a representative symbol of the words of Christ.

<sup>61</sup>I will not go into the full details of this crisis because it is beyond the scope of this paper. Here are a few details and references where the reader may follow up. Most of the

church early in his presentations in 1897, but it was with the review of his book *The Living Temple* in 1902 that the crisis became specific in direct relationship to Kellogg's written words.<sup>62</sup> White wrote to A. G. Daniells of her concerns in 1903.<sup>63</sup> Kellogg made clear claims that God was in all and all was in God. He also tied these concepts to indwelling.<sup>64</sup> White made clear distinctions concerning the separation of God from nature in this text, which provided clarification for this discussion of indwelling within her writings.

White's first argument is the lack of teaching Christ gave to his disciples about God dwelling personally in the things of nature. If this had been true, White argues that Jesus would most certainly have taught his disciples about such things. But instead, "Christ and the apostles taught clearly the truth of the existence of a personal God." White uses the phrase "personal God" to insist on a God who is ontologically separate from his creation.<sup>65</sup> The terminology of "personal God" is also used to argue against God simply being an organizing principle, although God sustains all things, White argues that God is a personal being, rather than the philosophical logos.<sup>66</sup>

In a statement about Jesus' prayer in John 17:20-23, White makes one of her most striking statements about the nature of the union between the believer and Christ as well as the nature of the union of the Trinity itself: "The unity that exists

---

work done on Kellogg suggests pantheism as the label for his belief system. I believe his reference to God being in all and all being in God, yet differentiating between God and the world is closer to panentheism. Kellogg even claims that he still believes in a personal God, for without one there would be no worship. See Ruskjer, "Kellogg," 19. Nevertheless White speaks against pantheism in reference to this crisis, as does A. G. Daniells. See Pittack, "The Pantheistic Crisis in S.D.A. History," 6. White does recognize however that Kellogg's beliefs are confused, in Spicer's justification for publishing *The Living Temple*, he cites 23 times that Kellogg mentions a personal savior. As confused as Kellogg may have been, White still calls the theology in *The Living Temple* part of the last deception. See Ruskjer, "Kellogg," 21, 23.

<sup>62</sup>"But the first time Kellogg publicly introduced pantheism was in 1897 in a series of talks to ministers before the Lincoln, Nebraska General Conference session." See Ruskjer, "Kellogg," 13.

<sup>63</sup>Ruskjer, "Kellogg," 13.

<sup>64</sup>Ruskjer quotes Kellogg, "The heart needs a sleepless intelligence, a will that never sleeps. So with every heartbeat there is evidence of divine power within the body, that can intelligently direct...you can explain this in no other way than by saying that God dwells in the body." See Ruskjer, "Kellogg," 17.

<sup>65</sup>Ellen G. White, *Testimony for the Church*, 9 vols. (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1948), 8:266.

<sup>66</sup>White does not use the term logos herself in this context. The emanating principle, which she refers to here, is traditionally called the logos in philosophical circles. The logos is the current terminology for the process theology position of the divine incarnation with in all of creation. See White, *Testimony for the Church*, 8:265-266.

between Christ and His disciples does not destroy the personality of either. They are one in purpose, in mind, in character, but not in person. It is thus that God and Christ are one.”<sup>67</sup> Not only is the unity of Christ with humanity not an ontological union of one person with another, but also the unity of the Trinity does not have this property either. White insists that the union of humanity with God does not in any way eliminate the personality of either.<sup>68</sup>

White’s insistence on the “dwelling on” Christ rather than on the self is more critically defined in her arguments against pantheism in this volume of the *Testimonies*. She claims that believing in God as an essence that pervades all of nature and therefore humanity as well removes the need for a savior. Any person can simply focus on him or herself for salvation because the essence of God is in the person.<sup>69</sup> White argues instead for the Scripture revealed personal savior and the sinner’s need of such a personal savior.<sup>70</sup>

The contribution of the *Testimonies* volume 8 section 5 to the discussion concerning indwelling is a clear distinction between the ontological union of

<sup>67</sup>White, *Testimony for the Church*, 8:263.

<sup>68</sup>White, *Testimony for the Church*, 8:269. Panentheists make the same claim for their system, the personalities of the beings are not combined they remain distinct from one another while the energy based reality of God and the world are still united. Cobb says it this way, “I believe it offers us our best analogy for thinking of the spatial relation of God and the world. God’s standpoint is all-inclusive, and so, in a sense, we are parts of God. But we are not parts of God in the sense that God is simply the sum total of the parts or that the parts are lacking in independence and self-determination. God and the creatures interact as separate entities, while God includes the standpoints of all of them in his omnispatial standpoint. In this sense God is everywhere, but he is not everything. The world does not exist outside God or apart from God, but the world is not God or simply part of God. The character of the world is influenced by God, but it is not determined by him, and the world in its turn contributes novelty and richness to the divine experience. The doctrine that I am developing here is a form of ‘panen-theism.’” See Cobb, *God/World*, 79-80. White on the other hand insists that God is separate from his creation and only united in “purpose, mind, and character.” See White, *Testimony for the Church*, 8:263.

<sup>69</sup>White, *Testimony for the Church*, 8:269.

<sup>70</sup>“Our condition through sin has become preternatural, and the power that restores us must be supernatural, else it has no value. There is but one power that can break the hold of evil from the hearts of men, and that is the power of God in Jesus Christ. Only through the blood of the Crucified One is there cleansing from sin. His grace alone can enable us to resist and subdue the tendencies of our fallen nature. This power the spiritualistic theories concerning God make of no effect. If God is an essence pervading all nature, then He dwells in all men; and in order to attain holiness, man has only to develop the power that is within him. These theories, followed to their logical conclusion, sweep away the whole Christian economy. They do away with the necessity for the atonement and make man his own savior.” See White, *Testimony for the Church*, 8:291.

beings concerning God and His creation as well as the persons of the Trinity. White also makes a strong case for a personal God and Savior. These contributions only serve to clarify the previous direction of White's understanding of indwelling based on an abiding relationship through faith and surrender to a personal being that is outside of the human person. This requires the individual to "dwell on" something other than themselves for the power of salvation and transformation of the heart, mind, and character of the believer.

### *Comparison of THE Four Passages*

#### Chronological Development of Thought

The chronological development of thought seen in these four texts is one of expansion and clarification. As has been shown in the analysis, the basis of understanding indwelling for Ellen White is an abiding relationship. This was clear in *Steps to Christ*, the letter to Sister Wessels, and *Desire of Ages*. While it was not stated so clearly in *Testimonies* volume 8, it was clarified in a significant way to show that abiding is one of interpersonal devotion rather than co-constitution of being. I do not see any chronological contradictions in the comparison of these texts but rather a progression, expansion, and clarification of thought regarding the abiding nature of indwelling.

#### Combined Definition of Indwelling

The combined definition of indwelling from these four passages is what I would like to call interpersonal devotional indwelling. Indwelling is interpersonal as opposed to a co-constitutional participation in being.<sup>71</sup> Just as the Godhead is

<sup>71</sup>Co-constitution of being is the language of Cobb. I choose to use interpersonal rather than relational because of the connections with the process relational nature of reality. They do not mean an interpersonal one but that a participation in the being of all that is around us through a redefined energy based reality. Using these ideas to interpret Paul in the book of Romans, Cobb says, "Paul's language was often that of mutual immanence and participation. He often wrote of the mutual indwelling of the faithful and Christ or the Spirit, and of the participation of the faithful in Jesus' death and resurrection. Yet the way reality was conceptualized in the Greco-Roman and Medieval worlds forced thinkers to interpret what Paul wrote about Christ, his death and resurrection, and the Spirit in terms of external relations-that is, as realities or events that do not, indeed cannot, effect any essential change in the faithful. Modern thought, with its understanding of reality as consisting of unrelated, static substances, only intensified this need. Partly as a result, many people are looking outside the old-line churches for a fuller experience of their relations with God and with one another and a more adequate interpretation of that experience than sophisticated thought has allowed them in the Western church. Process or process-relational thought, to which the authors of this commentary subscribe, recovers



made up of three interdependent persons so the union of humanity with God is separate persons who choose to recognize their need for God, becoming fully dependent on Christ for their spiritual growth. Indwelling is devotional in the sense of abiding surrender to Christ, which requires a devoted dwelling on Christ's character so that the believer's character can be transformed. The transformed character is the clearest understanding of indwelling. By devotedly beholding the person of Christ and his character the believer's character has been so transformed that the word and character of Christ are literally being lived out in the believer. He or she has the character of Christ living in him or her.

### *Summary and Conclusion*

Ellen White rejected the transcendent immortal soul dualism as a possibility for the indwelling spirit; she also rejected the panentheistic immanent idea of God as essence in all of creation. What option does this leave for White for an understanding of indwelling? From this initial limited study of White, one can discern a consistent teaching of indwelling as interpersonal abiding. The believer must surrender his or her life to God in faith by consecrating oneself to a continual communion of open communication with God through his revealed word. By accepting the character of Christ revealed in his word and explained through the mediation of the Holy Spirit, the believer is then open to the transforming work of the Spirit on his or her character to be shaped in such a way that the purpose, will, and desire of Christ is living in him or her on a day to day basis. In other words, by beholding one becomes changed and the change is so great that it can only be the result of the Holy Spirit transforming the character of fallen humanity to be like that of the living God as one abides in Christ.

The implications of this study for Adventism are significant. Given the special role of Ellen White in Adventist thought, particularly in pointing to and stimulating a correct understanding of Scripture, this study of her view on indwelling should be followed by a full canonical study of this issue in Scripture.

In addition White also reveals her Protestant values in the discussion of the indwelling of the spirit. First believing as well as spiritual growth are accomplished by the means of faith alone, the understanding comes through scripture alone, and spiritual growth is done through Christ alone. She does depart from the traditional Protestant view of the immortality of the soul. This departure, however, makes the need for a devotional indwelling stronger as it leaves no room for ontological indwelling within the soul.

---

the understanding of mutual immanence and participation in such a way that Paul's teaching can be taken much more straightforwardly." See Cobb and Lull, *Romans*, 19.

## **WESLEY AND CHARISMA: AN ANALYSIS OF JOHN WESLEY'S VIEW OF SPIRITUAL GIFTS**

DOJCIN ZIVADINOVIC

Ph.D. Candidate in Church History (Andrews University)  
zivadino@andrews.edu

### *Abstract*

18th century English reformer, John Wesley is one of the most influential figures in the history of Christianity. As a key theological leader behind the first religious awakening (1730-1760) in England and America, Wesley is often credited for setting the stage for the contemporary Charismatic and Pentecostal ideas. This article's purpose is to clarify John Wesley's attitude towards the doctrine of Spiritual Gifts and especially towards the more dynamic charismas such as the gifts of healing, the gift of prophecy, exorcism of evil spirits and speaking with tongues. Especially important for understanding Wesley's thought is his opposition to Calvin's *cessationism*, and the growing trends of rationalistic Deism, which were prominent in his time. At the same time Wesley emphatically challenged what he considered "fanatical" usage of spiritual gifts and charismas both outside and within the Methodist movement.

Keywords: Martin Luther; John Calvin; Philipp Jacob Spener; John Wesley; Methodists; Methodism; Pietism; spiritual gifts; Holy Spirit; speaking in tongues; prophetic gift; prophecy; exorcism; healings.

### *Introduction*

John Wesley belonged to a small group of extraordinary men and women who dared to dramatically modify the world in which they lived. Born and raised in 1700s in Epworth, a small English village, Wesley studied in London and Oxford. He later became an ardent student of the Bible and subsequently a passionate preacher whose sermons and writings changed the approach to religion in England and further through the entire Protestant world. The Methodist movement, of which Wesley was the main founder, introduced a new feature in the 18th century Protestant Christianity. That feature was an emphasis on personal experience of pardon, love, conversion and sanctifying work of God inside of the individual. Methodist combination of pietism, personal holiness and experiential Christianity, also opened the way for the renewal of a long forgotten doctrine of spiritual gifts.

When we speak of spiritual gifts or charismas, we evoke the words of the Apostle Paul: “Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit ... and to each one the manifestation of the Spirit is given for the common good” (1 Cor 12:7). According to the teaching of the New Testament the gifts of the spirit represent special capabilities and actions given to all believers through the work of the Holy Spirit for the edification of the body of Christ – Church.<sup>1</sup>

This study intends to investigate the importance English reformer John Wesley placed upon the doctrine of spiritual gifts. What part do the gifts and manifestations of the Spirit play in the process of justification and sanctification for Wesley? In addition, this study is to explore whether John Wesley believed in the perpetuity of more dynamic gifts such as prophecy, tongues, healing and so on, and if he did, what was their significance for the life of a Christian?

### *Views on Spiritual Gifts during the Reformation*

John Wesley lived in a milieu in which each Protestant group viewed the gift of the Spirit in a different light. The following section will examine the approaches and the prevailing Protestant views on the ordinary and supernatural gifts of the Spirit prior and during Wesley’s time.

### Reformed, Puritan, and Anglican Churches

John Wesley was born in 18<sup>th</sup> century England dominated by Puritan and Anglican Christians. The English Puritans highly venerated the writings of French Reformer John Calvin, founder of Reformed Protestantism. John Calvin firmly maintained Augustine’s position of cessation of extraordinary gifts holding that direct divine inspiration declined after the completing of Scriptural Canon.<sup>2</sup> However, Calvin’s denial of spiritual manifestations was actually less rigid than many of his followers in that he held that in un-evangelized areas, supernatural gifts might recur to confirm the Gospel.<sup>3</sup>

Reformed Churches followed Calvin’s prerogatives on this issue and developed the concept of radical cessationism, which excluded any contemporary contact between man and God other than the Holy Scriptures. This position was partially motivated by the increased use of Catholic miracle stories in their Anti-Protestant polemics.<sup>4</sup> The anti-supernaturalist tendencies present in the English

<sup>1</sup>See 1 Cor 12; Rom 12; and Eph 4:8-11.

<sup>2</sup>John Calvin, *Institutes*, book I, 14:17; 18:2, book II, 4:5, book IV, 8:6; 9:4.

<sup>3</sup>Calvin, *Institutes*, book IV, 3:4.

<sup>4</sup>See John Ruthven, *On the Cessation of the Charismata; the Protestant Polemic on Postbiblical Miracles*, in *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*, supplement series 3 (Sheffield: Academic Press, 1993), 36.

Puritanism eventually helped create the growth of deistic rationalism and other ideas of non-involvement of God in contemporary affairs of man.<sup>5</sup>

The official Anglican Church, however, never officially adopted Calvinistic position on cessation of spiritual gifts and many Anglican bishops believed in some scarce continuance of miraculous in modern days. Bishop Butler's answer to deists in *Analogy of Religion* argues that one cannot completely understand the laws of nature and therefore there is always room for miraculous and extraordinary revelations.<sup>6</sup> He reveals the general belief among Anglican clergy that supernatural actions of God can still be displayed in Christian communities although these are not fully understood and therefore cannot be anticipated. Thus, although Anglicans never officially developed the cessationist position, the extraordinary gifts in Anglican Church were not expected nor particularly encouraged.

By the time John Wesley stepped on the scene of public life in England, the "rational religion" in England began to gain serious steam. Extreme skepticism and rationalism came to shape Protestant Orthodoxy, which boldly asserted that nothing happens beyond one's own experience and preconceptions about the nature.

#### Lutheran, Pietist and Moravian Views of the Spiritual Gifts

Lutheranism, in its inception, was much more open to the supernatural manifestations of the Spirit than the Reformed tradition. One of the major points of Luther's early theological debates was his emphasis on the ability of laity to participate in religious life, to understand scriptures, and to be equal in spiritual matters with the clerics and magistrates. For Luther, the New Testament concept of "priesthood of all believers,"<sup>7</sup> meant that all Christians are truly "priests" and they ought to minister to others with the gifts of grace God has bestowed on every converted member.<sup>8</sup> Luther, hence, concluded that "each justified believer might expect to receive one of several other gifts of the Holy Spirit."<sup>9</sup>

While rebuking the fanatical spirits of Zwickau prophets and extreme Spirit-searching of Karlstadt, Luther never denied the extraordinary working of Spirit in his days. He himself claimed spiritual inspiration. "Dear friend, say what you will about the Spirit, I too have been in the Spirit and have seen the Spirit, perhaps

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., 36-39.

<sup>6</sup>Joseph Butler, *The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed* (London: John and Paul Knapton, 1736), 186.

<sup>7</sup>See 1 Pet 2:5-9, Rev 1:5, 6; 5:10.

<sup>8</sup>See for example Luther, "Psalm 110" (1535), in *Luther's Works*, 56 vols., ed. H. Lehmann and J. Pelikan (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), 13:294, 295 (later abbreviated as *LW*).

<sup>9</sup>Luther, "Selected Psalms," in *LW*, 12:294; Luther, "A Sermon on Keeping Children in School," in *LW* 46:220, 221.

even more of it than those fellows with all their boasting will see in a year.”<sup>10</sup> Luther firmly believed that extraordinary gifts are still available in his days. He held that such gifts as healing,<sup>11</sup> speaking and interpreting tongues,<sup>12</sup> expelling of demons<sup>13</sup> and various miracles and signs would come to very devout and pious people.<sup>14</sup>

In spite of Luther’s emphasis on the gifts of the Spirit, Lutheranism gradually developed a rationalist theology, which was closely related to Calvin’s cessationism. This occurred as Lutheran leaders attempted to counter radical Anabaptist emphasis on extraordinary gifts and Catholic claims of miracles. Many fanatical prophets in Germany made Lutheran churches quickly grow weary of extraordinary gifts and charismas.

The 17<sup>th</sup> century Pietists responded to this marginalization of gifts in Lutheranism by placing more emphasis on the work of the Holy Spirit, re-introducing the concept of various Spiritual ministries in the Church. Johan Arndt and Philipp Jacob Spener, in their attempts to revive churches in Germany, often

<sup>10</sup>Luther, “To the Councilmen of All Cities in Germany That They Establish and Maintain Christian Schools,” (1524) in *LW* 45:365.

<sup>11</sup>See Luther, “A Prelude on the Babylonian Captivity of the Church,” (1520) in *Works of Martin Luther*, 6 vols., ed. A. J. Holman (Philadelphia: 1915), 2:288, 289. Luther often prayed for the sick and was recorded to heal Melanchthon on one occasion. See *LW* 50:209, n. 17. For more on the attitude of Protestant Reformers towards healing see Ronald K. Rittgers, *The Reformation of Suffering* (Oxford: University Press, 2012), 329, n. 80.

<sup>12</sup>Luther interpreted the “gift of tongues” as the ability to speak Biblical languages and interpret obscure passages of the Scripture. He links this gift closely to the gift of prophecy, which for him represents the ability to defend the Bible truth and interpret scriptures against the heretics and false teachers. See Luther, “Concerning the Order of Public Worship,” (1523) in *LW* 53:12; and Luther, “The Judgment of Martin Luther on Monastic Vows,” (1521) in *LW* 44:323, 324.

<sup>13</sup>Luther closely connected gift of healing with demons expelling. He stated: “Often has it happened, and still does, that devils have been driven out in the name of Christ; also by calling on His name and prayer, the sick have been healed.” In his treatise against the papacy: he asserts that repelling of demons is one of the gifts present in the Church of his time. He even states that some are better or more gifted in this ministry than the others. Martin Luther, “Against the Roman Papacy, an Institution of Devil,” (1545) in *LW* 41:358.

<sup>14</sup>Luther did not deny the possibility of miracles. He states: “In Acts 15, Apostle Paul demonstrated evangelical freedom [of pagans] by the miracles and wonders God had wrought ... when testimonies of Scriptures give no precedent, we must rely on works [miracles] of God and be guided by them in the absence of scriptural testimony.” See Luther, “The Judgment of Martin Luther on Monastic Vows,” (1521) in *LW* 44:377. See also Luther, “Sermon am Auffahrtstage,” May 29, 1522, in *WA* (*Weimar Edition*), 10, III, 144, 145. However, Luther was very aware of false miracles. He states that extraordinary gifts are not an indication that one has the true faith. See *WA*, 22:182.

referred to various gifts that can serve for missionary purpose and for the edification of the community.<sup>15</sup>

Under the leadership of Spener's student, Nicolaus von Zinzendorf, German Pietism experienced considerable growth and revival, reaching international influence. After many years of earnest prayers, an extraordinary outpouring of the Holy Spirit was recorded in 1727. The revival was followed by prophetic gifts, gifts of healing and gifts of speaking foreign languages. This outpouring launched Moravian missionary endeavors to West Indies, America, India, Eastern Africa and other places.<sup>16</sup> Moravian theology and practices directly influenced Methodist brothers John and Charles Wesley especially in the aspect of experiential religion. The Wesley brothers and the other Oxford Methodists welcomed great number of European religious immigrant and refugees, including the Moravians, French Camisards, and Huguenots.

### *Wesley's Doctrine of the Spiritual Gifts*

Early in his life as an Anglican minister, John Wesley hasn't paid much attention to the idea of revival of the apostolic gifts in the Church. It was the conversations with Peter Bohler and other German Pietist, combined with his readings of the Eastern Fathers that slowly begun to shape Wesley's thoughts on the active role of the Holy Spirit in Christian experience.<sup>17</sup>

After accepting doctrine of assurance from the Moravian Pietists, Wesley began preaching for an inward conviction of the conversion and the work of the Holy Spirit in individuals. In his *Journal* entry for August 15, 1750, Wesley expresses his belief why the gifts have diminished through the ages.

The cause of this [decline of spiritual gifts following Constantine] was not, (as has been vulgarly supposed,) 'because there was no more occasion for them,' because all the world was become Christians. This is a miserable mistake; not a twentieth part of it was then nominally Christian. The real cause was, 'the love of many,' almost of all Christians, so called, was 'waxed cold.' The Christians had no more of the Spirit of Christ than the other Heathens. The Son of Man, when he came to examine his Church, could hardly 'find faith upon earth.' This was the real cause why the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost were no longer to be found in the

<sup>15</sup>Johann Arndt, *True Christianity* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979), 151, 195-199; Philipp Jacob Spener, *Pia Desideria* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), 13, 89-95.

<sup>16</sup>Joseph E. Hutton, *A History of Moravian Missions* (London: Moravian Publication Office, 1922), 78-120. See also Stanley M. Burgess, "Medieval and Modern Western Churches," in *Initial Evidence*, ed. Gary B. McGee (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), 32.

<sup>17</sup>For the roots of Wesley's theology see Randy Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley's Practical Theology* (London: Abingdon Press, 1994).

Christian Church; because the Christians were turned Heathens again, and had only a dead form left.<sup>18</sup>

The implication is that if a revival of true love and genuine piety manifests today, the gifts and works of the Spirit would naturally spring out as in the early days. Although the “more excellent way” is the way of love, Wesley still insisted that we may “covet earnestly” such gifts as evangelism to “sound the unbelieving heart” or the gift of knowledge to understand both the providence and the grace of God, or the gift of faith “which on particular occasions ... goes far beyond the power of natural causes”<sup>19</sup>

Wesley’s assertion on the gifts and manifestations of the Spirit was not merely theoretical. His insistence upon the gifts of the Spirit also stemmed out of the early days of Methodist revival (1739-1759) where many individuals in London, Oxford and Bristol reported supernatural healings, visions, dreams, spiritual impressions, power in evangelizing, extraordinary bestowments of wisdom and so on.<sup>20</sup> Wesley held that after justification, the Spirit gives one gift or talent but a sanctified man receives five.<sup>21</sup> The Methodist movement grew rapidly on the wings of sanctification message, which included the bestowment of Holy Love, fruits and gifts of the Spirit.

### Wesley and Spiritual Fanaticism

Wesley admitted that genuine spiritual revival seldom happens without outburst of fanaticism. Fanaticism in the Methodist movement had many facets, going on from simple excitement-seeking attitude, which often resulted in uncontrolled and ecstatic behavior, onto the more elaborate theological departures.

Already in 1739, at the earliest stage of the Methodist revival, Wesley was directed to meet some descendants of French Huguenots who spoke ecstatically in unknown tongues without interpretation and calling it “gift of tongues.” At first, Wesley did not want to hinder their enthusiasm but after several of his members lost taste of religion due to extravagancy of these prophets, Wesley concluded that these individuals were not sent by God and earnestly exhorted “all

<sup>18</sup>Wesley, “The More Excellent Way,” (1787) in *Works of the Rev. John Wesley*, 12 vols. (London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 1872), 7:27 [hereafter referred to as *WRJW*]. See Wesley’s early longings for Fruits of the Holy Spirit in his diary entry of August 12, 1738 in *WRJW* 1:120ff; January 4, 1739 in *WRJW* 1:170-72. See also the entire sermon 4, “Scriptural Christianity,” August 24, 1747, in *WRJW* 5:37-52.

<sup>19</sup>Wesley, “The More Excellent Way,” in *WRJW* 7:27.

<sup>20</sup>Wesley’s Diary, June 16, 1739 in *WRJW* 1:204; August 29, 1746 in *WRJW* 2:22-26; *The Life of the Rev. John Wesley*, in *WRJW* 5:53. See also Richard P. Heitzenrater, *Wesley and the People Called Methodists* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995), 91, 92, 100.

<sup>21</sup>Wesley, Letter 740, “To My dear Betsy,” June 3, 1774 in *WRJW* 13:77.

that followed after holiness to avoid as fire all who do not speak according “to the law and the testimony.”<sup>22</sup>

Wesley especially warned Methodists to not replace personal revelations over the Holy Scripture. He said: “No, nor by any dreams, visions, or revelations supposed to be made to their souls, anymore than by their tears or any involuntary effects wrought upon their bodies.” The only certain test for Wesley was the test of “the law and the testimony” a reference to Isaiah 8:20, which he interpreted as a description of God's Word.<sup>23</sup>

Although Wesley was clearly in favor of manifestation of the Spirit, he did not renounce correcting the fanatics within his ranks. Wesley has seen those practices as counterfeit of the true work of God. One of the greatest trials for Wesley was the fanaticism introduced by two prominent Methodist ministers Thomas Maxwell and George Bell. Maxfield and Bell took the doctrine of sanctification to extremes. They claimed that the perfected Christian lived a life of angelic sinlessness on earth. Heitzenrater writes: “Their view led to a dangerous combination of assertive infallibility and blatant antinomianism; people began to imagine that they would not die or that they were immune from temptation. Some, like Bell, also began to practice faith-healing and speaking in tongues.”<sup>24</sup> Many other congregations followed them in their extremes. Here is the report Wesley received from the enthusiasts of William Williams:

It is common in the congregations attended by Mr. William Williams and one or two other clergymen, after the preaching is over, for anyone that has a mind to give out a verse of an hymn. This they sing over and over with all their might, perhaps above thirty, yea, forty times. Meanwhile the bodies of two or three, sometimes ten or twelve, are violently agitated, and they leap up and down, in all manner of postures, frequently for hours together.<sup>25</sup>

This is how Wesley commented on this experience:

I think there needs no great penetration to understand this. They are honest, upright men, who really feel the love of God in their hearts. But they have little experience, either of the ways of God or the devices of Satan. So he serves himself

<sup>22</sup>Wesley's Diary of June 22, 1739 in *WRJW* 1:205, 206.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid. On May 9, 1740 Wesley noted in his journal: “I was a little surprised at some who were buffeted of Satan in an unusual manner, by such a spirit of laughter as they could in no wise resist, though it was pain and grief unto them” (*WRJW* 1:271, 272). In his journal entry for May 21, 1740 Wesley again recorded some outburst of uncontrolled laughter, which he clearly connected, with the working of devil. See *WRJW* 1:272. See also October 25, 1739 in *WRJW* 1:236.

<sup>24</sup>Heitzenrater, *Wesley and the People Called Methodists*, 209, 210.

<sup>25</sup>Wesley's Diary, August 27, 1763 in *WRJW* 3:137.



of their simplicity, in order to wear them out and to bring a discredit on the work of God.<sup>26</sup>

Even in his older days, Wesley was reminiscent of his dislike of fanaticism he had witnessed all along his ministry. In his Journal on April 3, 1786, he reports several sorts of fanatic behavior he witnessed through his life. Although disagreeing with these practices, Wesley believes the fanatics should not be corrected harshly but with gentleness and love. He writes:

Satan strive to push many to extravagance. This appears in several instances. (1) Frequently three or four, yea, ten or twelve, pray aloud all together. (2) Some of them, perhaps many, scream all together as loud as they possibly can. (3) Some of them use improper, yea, indecent expressions in prayer. (4) Several drop down as dead and are as stiff as a corpse, but in a while they start up and cry, Glory! Glory! perhaps twenty times together. Just so did the French Prophets, and very lately the Jumpers in Wales, bring the real work into contempt. Yet whenever we reprove them, it should be in the most mild and gentle manner possible.<sup>27</sup>

### Wesley and Ordinary Gifts

Despite many obvious outbursts of fanaticism John Wesley has never renounced his faith in genuine work of the Holy Spirit. He firmly maintained that the Spiritual gifts are a natural consequence of genuine holiness and dwelling of God's Spirit in a man. Wesley never placed a special emphasis on any gift in particular. In contrary, he esteemed the ordinary gifts on the same level of importance as more dynamic and supernatural charismas. Consequently, Wesley often mentions the importance of ordinary gifts such as music, preaching, teaching, service, wisdom, counseling and other "common gifts" bestowed on Christians.<sup>28</sup>

In his notes on 1 Cor. 12 Wesley defines the gift of wisdom as "a power of understanding and explaining the manifold wisdom of God in the grand scheme of gospel salvation" while the gift of knowledge is described by him as "an extraordinary ability to understand and explain the Old Testament types and prophecies". Wesley maintained that the *gift of faith* differs from a general faith

<sup>26</sup>Ibid.

<sup>27</sup>Wesley's Diary, April 3, 1786 in *WRJW* 3:329. How Wesley treated fanaticism is seen in a letter to his brother Charles, written in 1762: "This week I have begun to speak my mind concerning five or six honest enthusiasts. But I move only a hair's breadth at a time. No sharpness will profit. There is need of a lady's hand, as well as a lion's heart." See Letter 62, January 5, 1762 in *WRJW* 12:122, 123.

<sup>28</sup>Gift of speech – "The More Excellent Way" in *WRJW* 7:27. Gift of teaching and gift of knowledge – Letter 704, "Letter to Miss Bishop," September 1, 1771, *WRJW* 13:22, 23.

given to all believers. The special gift of faith is as Wesley puts it “an extraordinary trust in God under the most difficult or dangerous circumstances.”<sup>29</sup>

Although particularly encouraging the use of so called “ordinary gifts”<sup>30</sup> and often rebuking fanatics for their charismatic claims and behaviors, Wesley did not minimize the usefulness of more extraordinary gifts and manifestations of the Spirit.

### *Wesley and Extraordinary Gifts*

In his life, Wesley experienced many extraordinary activities of the Spirit that he considered to be genuine. In the earliest days of the revival of Fetter-Lane Society, Wesley records that the revival started with an extraordinary outpouring of the Spirit on the entire congregation. He remembers that it is in that day he had repented from unbelief in manifestations of God’s Spirit. Here are his words:

We met at Fetter-Lane to humble ourselves before God ... we acknowledged our having grieved him ... by blaspheming his work among us, imputing it either to nature, to the force of imagination and animal spirits, or even to the delusions of devil. In that hour we found God with us as at the first. Some fell prostrate upon the ground. Others burst out, as with one consent, into loud praise and thanksgiving.<sup>31</sup>

Since that moment on, Wesley never doubted the extraordinary workings of the Spirit. A letter written to deist scholar Conyers Middleton is Wesley’s most definitive statement on the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Wesley here lists the various extraordinary gifts that he expects to see revived in any age that manifests the true faith and love. These are some extraordinary gifts Wesley considered useful for the evangelizing: “1. Casting out devils; 2. Speaking with new tongues; 3. Escaping dangers, in which otherwise they must have perished; 4. Healing the sick; 5. Prophecy, foretelling things to come; 6. Visions; 7. Divine dreams; and, 8. Discerning of spirits.”<sup>32</sup> In the following pages, we shall analyze Wesley’s view of four extraordinary gifts – Prophecy, Tongues, Healing and Exorcism.

### *Gift of Prophecy, Visions and Dreams*

In his ministry Wesley encountered an unusual number of persons who claimed special revelations and visions. Many, according to Wesley were simply over-

<sup>29</sup>See Wesley’s notes on 1 Cor 12:9 in John Wesley, *Explanatory Notes Upon the New Testament* (London: 1757), 457.

<sup>30</sup>See Sermon 4, “On Christianity” in WRJW 5:37-52; Sermon 89, “The More Excellent Way,” WRJW 7:27.

<sup>31</sup>Wesley’s Diary, June 16, 1739 in WRJW 1:204.

<sup>32</sup>Wesley, “A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Conyers Middleton,” January 4, 1749 in WRJW 10:21.

enthusiastic but in some instances Wesley found prophetic revelations and special visions to be genuine and full of holy love. One of the individuals who gained Wesley's confidence as having genuine visions from God was Ann Thorn. This is what Wesley recorded concerning Ann Thorn.

I talked largely with Ann Thorn, and two others who had been several times in trances. What they all agreed in was 1. That when they went away, as they termed it, it was always at the time they were fullest of the love of God; 2. That it came upon them in a moment, without any previous notice, and took away all their senses and strength; 3. That there were some exceptions; but in general, from that moment, they were in another world, knowing nothing of what was done or said, by all that were round about them.<sup>33</sup>

In the case of Ann Thorn, Wesley seems to accept her revelations as genuine. Sometimes, Wesley tested the prophets with some physical motions as in the case of Alice Miller. After he was convinced in their genuineness, he would question them what was the content of their visions. Here is one such account:

About five in the afternoon I heard them singing hymns. Soon after Mr. B. came up and told me, Alice Miller (fifteen years old) was fallen into trance. I went down immediately, and found her sitting on a stool and leaning against the wall, with her eyes opened and fixed upward. I made a motion as if going to strike; but they continued immovable. Her face showed an unspeakable mixture of reverence and love ... in about half an hour I observed her countenance change into the form of fear, pity and distress ... and silent tears stole down her cheeks ... about seven her sense returned. I asked: "where have you been?" "I have been with the Savior" ... "Why then did you cry?" "Not for myself, but for the world; for I saw they were on the brink of hell." Whom did you desire to give glory to God?" "Ministers that cry aloud to the world; Else they will be proud; and then God will leave them, and they will lose their own souls."<sup>34</sup>

One of the greatest uses of visions and dreams from God for Wesley was the power to convert both individuals who experience it and the individuals who hear the testimony of this powerful experience. Here are his comments:

I have seen ...very many persons changed in a moment from the spirit of despair to the spirit of love, joy and peace, and from sinful desire, till then reigning over them, to a pure desire of doing the will of God. ... What I have to say touching visions and dreams, is this: I know several persons in whom this great change was wrought in a dream, or during a strong representation to the eye of their mind, of Christ either on the cross, or in glory. This is the fact.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>33</sup>Wesley's Diary, August 6, 1759 in *WRJW* 2:509.

<sup>34</sup>*Ibid.* See also Wesley's account of the seven-year old child who had many visions "astonishing the neighbours with her innocent, awful manner of declaring them." See Diary, June 14, 1759 in *WRJW* 2:499.

<sup>35</sup>Wesley's Diary, May 20, 1739 in *WRJW* 1:195.

Another use for prophetic gift is foretelling of future, which is beneficial for the entire community.<sup>36</sup> Close to the prophetic spirit, Wesley placed the ability to discern the spirits. In his notes on 1 Corinthians 12, Wesley mentions the “gift of discernment” which according to him represents ability to know “whether men be of an upright spirit or not; whether they have natural or supernatural gifts for offices in the church; and whether they who profess to speak by inspiration speak from a divine, a natural, or a diabolical spirit.”<sup>37</sup>

Although Wesley never prohibited extraordinary revelations, he did not trust every spirit. On one occasion, Wesley wrote: “Trust not in visions and dreams; in sudden impressions, or strong impulse of any kind. Remember, it is not by these you are to know what is the will of God on any particular occasion; but by applying the plain scripture rule, with the help of experience and reason, and the ordinary assistance of the Spirit of God.”<sup>38</sup>

In his sermon touching the enthusiasm of Methodists, Wesley admits genuine visions and dreams are not so frequent.<sup>39</sup> Wesley was firm that all personal revelations have to be in strict accordance with the Word of God.

### Gift of Healing

In response to Middleton's insistence that no “miraculous healing” had ever been proved, Wesley responded:

Sir, I understand you well ... after all this talk about miraculous cures, we are not sure there were ever any in the world. But it will do no harm. For although we grant, that some recover, even in seemingly desperate cases; and, that we do not know, in any case, the precise bounds between nature and miracle; yet it does not follow, therefore, I cannot be assured there ever was a miracle of healing in the world. To explain this by instance: I do not precisely know how far nature may go in healing, that is restoring sight of the blind; yet this I assuredly know, that if a man born blind is restored to sight by a word, this is not nature, but miracle.<sup>40</sup>

Wesley was not claiming the perpetuity of the gift of healing in theory only, he experienced it personally. In his explanatory notes of the Bible, for the passage of Mark 16: 17, Wesley records one of his experiences at the town of Leonberg, where a crippled was healed through the preaching of this text.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>36</sup>See Wesley on 1 Cor 13:2 and 14:6 in *Explanatory Notes*, 459, 461.

<sup>37</sup>See Wesley on 1 Cor 12:9 in *Explanatory Notes*, 457.

<sup>38</sup>*Ibid.*, sec. 38.

<sup>39</sup>“I do not deny that God has of old times, manifested his will in this manner; or that he can do so now; Nay, I believe he does, in some very rare instances.” See Wesley, Sermon 37, “On The Nature of Enthusiasm” in *WRJW* 5:473.

<sup>40</sup>Wesley, “Letter to Middleton” in *WRJW* 10:22.

<sup>41</sup>Wesley on Mark 16:17 in *Explanatory Notes*, 138.

In another instance, Wesley shares an experience of extraordinary healing which happened before hundreds of witnesses in Cornwall. John Trebble, a crippled man who for sixteen years was obliged to walk on his hands because his legs were paralyzed, was restored to health through an encounter with an angel in his dream. Wesley writes in a short report: "I took a strict examination in my last visitation. ... he was suddenly so restored to his limbs that I saw him able to walk and get his own maintenance."<sup>42</sup>

Wesley was a full believer in healing by prayer. He prayed many times for his own recovery and recorded that God healed him from many infirmities in his life. Wesley describes one of his healings in this way: "In the evening, at the chapel, my teeth pained me much. In coming home, Mr. Spear gave me an account of the rupture he had for some years, which, after the most eminent physicians had declared it incurable, was perfectly cured in a moment. I prayed with submission to the will of God. My pain ceased, and returned no more."<sup>43</sup>

In the early days of Methodist Revival, Wesley records having experienced great power in praying for sick. Almost all of those who were visited by Wesley were restored to health. Some even claimed to experience supernatural healing with nothing but only touching Wesley's clothes.<sup>44</sup> Wesley reported: "I visited several of the sick. Most of them were ill of the spotted fever; which, they informed me, had been extremely mortal; few persons recovering from it. But God had said: 'Hitherto shalt thou come.' I believe there was not one with whom we were, but recovered."<sup>45</sup>

All throughout his ministry, Wesley experienced countless healings through prayer. In December 25, 1742, Wesley prayed for a man on his deathbed that recovered before the prayer was done.<sup>46</sup> In October 16, 1778, a woman who was sick for seven months immediately recovered after he visited her and prayed for her.<sup>47</sup> Wesley found one incident (the miraculous healing of breast cancer) especially intriguing:

December 26, 1761, I made a particular inquiry into the case of Mary Special, a young woman then in Tottenham-Court-Road. She said: 'Four years since I found much pain in my breasts, and afterwards hard lumps. Four months ago my left breast broke, and kept running continually. Growing worse and worse, after some time I was recommended to St. George's hospital. I was let blood many times, and took hemlock thrice a day; But it was no better; the pain and the lumps were the

<sup>42</sup>Wesley, "An Extraordinary Cure" in *WRJW* 11:511.

<sup>43</sup>Wesley's Diary, November 12, 1746 in *WRJW* 2: 34. See also Wesley's self-healing on March 21, 1741 in *WRJW* 1:304.

<sup>44</sup>Wesley's Diary, May 31, 1785 in *WRJW* 4:20.

<sup>45</sup>Wesley's Diary, November 16, 1740 in *WRJW* 1:291.

<sup>46</sup>Wesley's Diary, December 20, 25, 1742 in *WRJW* 1:405, 406.

<sup>47</sup>Wesley's Diary, October 16, 1778 in *WRJW* 4:139.

same, and both of my breasts were quite hard and black as soot; when yesterday se'n-night, I went to Mr. Owen's, where there was a meeting for prayer. Mr. Bell saw me and asked "Have you faith to be healed? I said 'Yes'. He prayed for me and in a moment all my pain was gone. But the next day I felt a little pain again. I clapped my hands on my breasts and cried out 'Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me whole.' It was gone and from that hour I have had no pain, no soreness, no lumps or swelling, but both my breasts were perfectly well, and have been ever since."<sup>48</sup>

Wesley then gives his conclusion: "Now here are plain facts. 1. She was ill: 2. She is well: 3. She became so in a moment. Which of these can with any modesty be denied?"<sup>49</sup>

It is important to note that Wesley did not articulate the belief that one person has perpetual ability to heal under any circumstance. It is the compassion and faith expressed through prayer and supplication that will allow God to heal. Healing happens only if God considers it beneficial to restore someone. Wesley doesn't explore whether one can have a special charisma of "miraculous healing". For Wesley, healing seems to be an occasional blessing. All we may employ is our love for a person and faith in power of God and let God do the rest.<sup>50</sup>

### Casting out Devils

In his sermon, "A Caution Against Bigotry", Wesley attempted to set the biblical and theological stage for "casting out devils." He writes, "In order to have the clearest view of this, we should remember, that (according to the scriptural account) as God dwells and works in the children of light so the devil dwells and works in the children of darkness. As the Holy Spirit possesses the souls of good men, so the evil spirit possesses the souls of the wicked."<sup>51</sup>

As with the gift of healing, regarding the expelling and casting of demonic forces, Wesley makes reference both to Scripture and experience. As he does with regard to all of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, Wesley responds to Middleton on the subject of "deliverance" openly and plainly: "The testimonies concerning this are out of number, and as plain as words can make them. To show, therefore, that all these signify nothing, and that there were never any devils cast out at all, neither

<sup>48</sup>Wesley's Diary, December 26, 1761 in *WRJW* 3:352, 353.

<sup>49</sup>*Ibid.*, 553.

<sup>50</sup>Wesley did not neglect the need for natural healing through the medical knowledge available to man. In his notes on 1 Cor 12 he comments: "The gift of healing need not be wholly confined to the healing diseases with a word or a touch. It may exert itself also, though in a lower degree, where natural remedies are applied; and it may often be this, not superior skill, which makes some physicians more successful than others. And thus it may be with regard to other gifts likewise." See Wesley on 1 Cor 12: 9 in *Explanatory Notes*, 457.

<sup>51</sup>Sermon 38, "A Caution Against Bigotry," (1746) in *WRJW* 5.

by the Apostles, nor since the Apostles, (for the argument proves both or neither,) is a task worthy of you”<sup>52</sup>

Middleton’s argument was that “those who were said to be possessed of the devil, may have been ill of the falling sickness ... the ordinary symptoms of an epilepsy.” As for the “evidence of devils speaking and answering to all questions,” Middleton simply shrugs. He accounts for these “by the arts of imposture, and contrivance between the persons concerned in the act.” Wesley’s reply is straightforward: “is not this something extraordinary, that men in epileptic fits should be capable of so much art and contrivance?”<sup>53</sup>

Wesleyan scholar Daniel Jennings counts sixteen cases of demoniac possession recorded in Wesley’s literary opus.<sup>54</sup> During one of his first contacts with the demoniac possession, which happened in the fall of 1739 at Bristol, Wesley admitted to be afraid and not willing to confront the possessed girl but prayed from distance. After a while, it was reported to him that a demon has left.<sup>55</sup> Two days later, as Wesley was called to pray for one unusual sick in Kingswood, he showed little more faith and courage. The account follows:

I was sent for to Kingswood again, to one of those who had been so ill before... When I was come, I was quite cold and dead, and fitter for sleep than prayer. She burst out into a horrid laughter, and said, “No power, no power; no faith, no faith. She is mine; her soul is mine. I have her, and will not let her go.” We begged of God to increase our faith. Meanwhile her pangs increased more and more; so that one would have imagined, by the violence of the throes, her body must have been shattered to pieces. One who was clearly convinced this was no natural disorder, said, “I think Satan is let loose. I fear he will not stop here.” And added, “I command thee, in the name of the Lord Jesus, to tell if thou hast commission to torment any other soul?” It was immediately answered, “I have. L—y C—r, and S—h J—s.” (Two who lived at some distance, and were then in perfect health.) We betook ourselves to prayer again; and ceased not, till she began, about six o’clock, with a clear voice, and composed, cheerful look, — Praise God, from whom all blessings flow.<sup>56</sup>

In *An Answer to A Report*, dated September 12, 1782, Wesley states that he was fully persuaded, that all the circumstances of demonic possession he related were literally and punctually true.<sup>57</sup> All the way throughout his ministry, Wesley

<sup>52</sup>Wesley, “Letter to Middleton,” (1759) in *WRJW* 10:41.

<sup>53</sup>*Ibid.*, 31, 32.

<sup>54</sup>See Daniel R. Jennings, *The Supernatural Occurrences of John Wesley* (Oklahoma City: Sean Multimedia, 2005), 8-37.

<sup>55</sup>See the entire account in Wesley’s Diary, October 25, 1739 in *WRJW* 1:236. Wesley’s very first encounter of demoniac possession happened two weeks earlier in October 12, 1739, where after prayer a mad woman poured out sounds of praise to God.

<sup>56</sup>Wesley’s Diary, October 27, 1739 in *WRJW* 1:236, 237.

<sup>57</sup>Wesley, *An Answer to A Report*, September 12, 1782 in *WRJW* 11:503.

experienced that through faith and a full measure of the Holy Spirit, demons usually flee from their victims who on their turn experience a miraculous change of character, praising and worshiping God who provided the deliverance.

### Speaking in Tongues

Although there is no record that Wesley himself ever spoke in tongues, there is evidence that he believed that this gift of the Holy Spirit was a legitimate gift for the Church of any age. I offer but two quotations from his letter to Middleton. In response to Middleton, Wesley writes:

Since the Reformation, you say, "This gift has never once been heard of... Sir, your memory fails you again: It has undoubtedly been pretended to, and that at no great distance either from our time or country. It has been heard of more than once, no farther off than the valleys of Dauphiny. Nor is it yet fifty years ago since the Protestant inhabitants of those valleys so loudly pretended to this and other miraculous powers, as to give much disturbance to Paris itself. And how did the King of France confute that pretense, and prevent its being heard any more? Not by the pen of his scholars, but by (a truly heathen way) the swords and bayonets of his dragoons.<sup>58</sup>

In the area of the Cevennes, the French Protestants, called "Camisards," claimed direct inspiration by the Holy Spirit. Their religious "enthusiasm" as well as their political resistance made them special targets of the king's wrath.<sup>59</sup> The "small prophets of Cevenne Mountains" as they were called, spoke and preached miraculously in foreign and unknown languages. Wesley used the example of Camisards to prove the point that the supernatural gifts can still be bestowed in this day and age.

Camisards believed in the perpetuity of spiritual gifts, quoting the prophecy of "latter rain" in Joel (3: 1), which they anticipated to be accomplished in their days.<sup>60</sup> Under the severe persecution, Camisards fled to England, where their charismatic practices soon came under the suspicion of their conservative

<sup>58</sup>Wesley, "Letter to Conveys Middleton" in *WRJW* 10:55, 56.

<sup>59</sup>Constituted mostly of peasants, Camisards resisted the attempts of Louis XIV to convert them to Roman Catholicism. Many were imprisoned, tortured, and martyred. See Gehrard von Polenz, "Camisards," in *Religious Encyclopedia*, ed. by Philipp Schaff, 4 vols. (New York: Funk & Wagnall's Co., 1891), 1:375, 376.

<sup>60</sup>Camisards found historical roots by developing an interesting view of church history, tracing their movement back to Waldensians. See John Lacy, *A Cry from the Desert* (London: n.p., 1708), v, vi. Another phenomenon which occurred frequently among the Camisards was the ability of infants who could not yet speak to deliver discourses in perfect, fluent French. See *ibid.*, 15, 137; Catherine Randall, *Camisards and Huguenots* (Athens: University of Georgia, 2011), 58.



Anglican neighbors. Upon their arrival to England, they entered in connection with Wesleyan Methodist movement.<sup>61</sup>

Wesley rejected the prophetic inspiration of some descendants of the French Camisards that immigrated to England. However, he believed that the original Camisards, persecuted for their faith in South of France in 1670s did experience authentic Spirit of prophecy and spoke in tongues they never learned. Wesley also mentions the account of early Church Father Irenaeus of Lyons who mentions many Christians in his time “speaking with all kinds of tongues, and expounding the mysteries of God.”<sup>62</sup>

It is reported that Wesley’s and Whitefield’s powerful sermons were occasionally followed by speaking in tongues.<sup>63</sup> This practice was most commonly experienced among American Methodists. Although, Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758), one of the main instigators of the First Great Awakening in America, was very hesitant to accept many of these ecstatic practices,<sup>64</sup> the awakening reunions abounded with exuberant exhibitions, such as spiritual prostration, visions, rolling, shouting, and occasional manifestations of speaking with unknown tongues.<sup>65</sup>

Opponents of the Awakening compared the spiritual manifestations among American revivalists with those of the French Prophets.<sup>66</sup> However, neither infidelity from within nor great opposition from without was to turn Methodism away from this emphasis. Neither Fletcher nor Wesley esteemed that Speaking with Tongues is an equivalent to the baptism of the Holy Spirit.<sup>67</sup> Wesley agrees with Paul that this gift may be given but to some rare believers quoting 1 Corinthians 12: 30 “Were all workers of miracles? Had all the gifts of healing? Did all speak with tongues?”<sup>68</sup>

<sup>61</sup>Polenz, “Camisards,” 376.

<sup>62</sup>“Letter to Middleton,” *WRJW* 10:60; Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 5.6.1 in *ANF* 1:771.

<sup>63</sup>Lynn Bridgers, *American Religious Experience: A Concise History* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006), 8.

<sup>64</sup>Jonathan Edwards, *A Treatise Concerning Religious Affection* (1746), re-edited by James Crissy (Philadelphia: 1821), 175, 431, 432.

<sup>65</sup>Ann Taves, *Fits, Trances and Visions: Experiencing Religion and Explaining Experience from Wesley to James* (Princeton: University Press, 1999), 13-44.

<sup>66</sup>See, for example, Charles Chauncy’s tract *A Faithful Account of the French Prophets, Their Agitations, Extasies and Inspiration* (Glasgow: 1742).

<sup>67</sup>Methodist leader in United States, John Fletcher (1729-1785) reported of cases of individuals moved by the Holy Spirit “speaking tongues of man and angels.” For Fletcher believers were often not rooted in faith. See John Fletcher, *Works*, 2 vols. (London: Thomas Alman, 1836), 1:127. For Fletcher, tongues are not a proof of conversion. See *ibid.*, 1:593.

<sup>68</sup>Wesley, Sermon 4, “On Scriptural Christianity” in *WRJW* 5:38.

Wesley did not elaborate quite a lot on the issue of xenolalia and glossolalia. His notes on 1 Corinthians 14, however seem to indicate that he did not expect believers to speak in unintelligible or angelic languages. Commenting on Paul's words "though I speak with the languages of man and angels", Wesley commented that Paul is talking about speaking languages "which are upon earth, and with the eloquence of an angel."<sup>69</sup> Further Wesley adds: "I will not act so absurdly, as to utter in a congregation what can edify none but myself."<sup>70</sup> Briefly, for Wesley, if the Spirit would impress a person to speak in an unknown tongue, this should always be an earthly language, which would need an interpretation in order for congregation to understand.

Although he never claimed this charisma; John Wesley argued that the gift of tongues can be displayed in his day and he, for his part, believed that it had authentic existence in other post-Apostolic centuries. He, however, warned against the "false enthusiast", imposing the test of Scripture and good fruits on all who claim divine inspiration.<sup>71</sup>

### *Summary and Conclusion*

The gifts of the Spirit combined with the doctrine of priesthood of all believers were one of the main axioms of early Reformation. However, later writings of the Lutheran and Reformed traditions neglected both the idea of the priesthood of all believers and of the perpetuity of Spiritual gifts, thus minimizing experiential aspects of the Christian religion.

Wesley's break with *cessationism* is variously interpreted today. Some claim that Wesley set the stage for the practices of the modern Charismatic movement. Others argue that Wesley's emphasis on Spiritual gifts and implication of laity in the spiritual affairs was just a marginal note in his theology of holy life. As usual, the truth is somewhere in the middle.

Wesley saw the gifts of the Spirit as a natural part of Christian experience connecting it with the doctrine of sanctification. For him, the lack or rarity of manifestations of the Spirit during long centuries of Christian dispensation was due to the declining spiritual life of the Church. In essence, the love of many "grew cold". Wesley's focal desire was to restore the piety and love of early Christians through indwelling power of the Holy Spirit. Experience of spiritual assurance, fruits of the Spirit, gifts and even supernatural manifestations of the Spirit were for Wesley, a natural consequence of God's power among true Christians, working for the edification of the saints and the spreading of the Gospel.

<sup>69</sup>Wesley on 1 Cor 13:1 in *Explanatory Notes*, 459.

<sup>70</sup>Wesley on 1 Cor 14:15 in *Explanatory Notes*, 461.

<sup>71</sup>Taves, *Fits, Trances and Visions*, 19.

It is important to note that although Wesley saw extraordinary gifts as a legitimate Christian experience, his treatment of gifts was different in regards to the blessing of assurance and the fruits of the Spirit. While he *actively* sought for spiritual assurance and for the fruits of Spirit (love, peace, meekness and so on), Wesley was more *passive* in expecting the manifestations of gifts of the Spirit. His main argument in regards to the gifts was that “they are available for Christians today” but he never made it a matter of doctrine to receive them, as it was the case with fruits of the Spirit or the assurance of the justification.

Because of the efforts of Wesley and other Methodist leaders, a great number of contemporary Christians today are convinced that the gifts of the Holy Spirit are just as relevant today as they were in the days of the apostles. However, many modern *perpetualists* have departed from Wesley in their belief that one is to *pursue* particular gifts of the Spirit. In many post-Wesleyan churches of “holiness tradition,” the gifts are often not merely humbly awaited but aggressively pursued. Some congregations even relegate Christians without apparent extraordinary gift to the category of “secondary believers.”

On the other side of the spectrum, some churches are increasingly hesitant to accept any supernatural manifestations – such as healings or prophecies – as genuine. Though Wesley opposed counterfeit gifts and fanatical manifestations, he never departed from his belief that God bestows gifts in his day and age. For Wesley, rejecting all the gifts (assuming some are not genuine) would lead to losing special blessings of God.

Unfortunately, as Wesley noted, people often tend to fall into either one of two camps when it comes to the miraculous. They will either “regard extraordinary circumstances too much...as if these were essential to the inward work” or they will “regard them too little, to condemn them altogether”<sup>72</sup>

In conclusion, it is clear that Wesley believed in continuance of gifts, charismas and special revelations. They are useful for edifying the church, impressing and converting souls to Christ and for foretelling future events. However, these do not serve the purpose of establishing the faith and doctrine. For Wesley, the basis of faith and doctrine is the sure Word of God; personal experience is on the second level only. The over-zealousness regarding spiritual charismas and extraordinary manifestations of the Spirit is not just a modern phenomenon. Wesley and other Methodists also experienced a number of over-enthusiastic and fanatical groups who took the spiritual gifts and the doctrine of sanctification too far altogether.

Today, just as in Wesley’s time, prophetic revelations, miraculous healings, unknown tongues, and other miracles are either over-zealously sought for or, on the other side, suspiciously shunned and avoided. Adventism is not immune from these two extremes. Ellen White, co-founder of the Seventh-day Adventist movement, herself a former Methodist, argued that one of the main goals of the devil is to create fanaticism so that he can make believers afraid of the Holy Spirit

<sup>72</sup>Wesley’s Diary, November 25, 1759 in *WRJW* 2:519.

and reject the Spiritual gifts altogether.<sup>73</sup> She wrote: “In every age, seasons of spiritual revival and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit have been followed by spiritual darkness and prevailing corruptions”.<sup>74</sup>

Let us, therefore, as Paul and Wesley, remain on the firm ground of the Holy Scriptures. While we seek godly lives, “perfecting our holiness” (1 Cor 7:1) let us not “quench the Spirit” (1 Thess 5:20) but test all the gifts and experiences through the lenses of the Word of God with fervent prayer. We are promised that an emphasis on studying the Scripture, prayer and earnest (non-legalistic) personal piety will shortly clear the way for genuine “latter rain” when “all flesh shall prophecy” (Joel 2:28) and the gospel shall be preached to “all tongues, peoples and nations” and then shall the end come (Matt 24:14).

<sup>73</sup>She wrote: “If Satan sees that the Lord is blessing His people and preparing them to discern his delusions, he will work with his master power to bring in fanaticism on the one hand and cold formalism on the other, that he may gather in a harvest of souls.” See Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages*, 3 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1958, 1980), 2:19; cf. Ellen G. White, *Testimonies for the Church*, 9 vols. (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1948), 1:230.

<sup>74</sup>Ellen G. White, Manuscript 45, 1893, printed in *Selected Messages*, 1:129, 130.



## LEO THE GREAT ON THE SUPREMACY OF THE BISHOP OF ROME

DENIS KAISER

Ph.D. Candidate in Adventist Studies (Andrews University)

denis@andrews.edu

### *Abstract*

Pope Leo the Great built his rationale for the supreme authority of the bishop of Rome on an existing tradition, yet with his additions he developed a theoretical rationale for later papal claims to absolute and supreme power in the ecclesiastical and secular realms. Previous bishops and church leaders had laid increasing stress on the unique role of the Apostle Peter as the founder of the Roman churches and episcopacy, the significance of the Roman bishop as Peter's successor, and the apostolic significance of the city and episcopacy of Rome. Yet Leo's rationale for the absolute control and power of the Roman bishop was founded on the ideas that Peter was still present and active in his successors, all ecclesiastical authority was mediated through him, Rome as a ecclesial monarchy was supposed to rule supreme above all churches, and Peter with his successors were to rule the universal church.

Keywords: Pope Leo the Great, papal primacy, Petrine primacy, leadership, Catholic theology, historical theology.

### *Introduction*

Born to a Tuscan family possibly in Velathri about A.D. 400, Leo was raised and educated in Rome during the first two decades of the fifth century. Having entered the clergy at an early age, he quickly rose to a position of importance.<sup>1</sup> He

<sup>1</sup>Philip A. McShane, "Leo I (440-61)," in *The Great Popes through History: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Frank J. Coppa (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2002), 51; *The Book of Pontiffs (Liber Pontificalis): The Ancient Biographies of the First Ninety Roman Bishops to A.D. 715*, 2nd rev. ed., Translated Texts for Historians, vol. 6 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000), 38-40. The following references illustrate Leo's increasing importance in ecclesiastical affairs already before his episcopate. Thus Augustine mentioned a Leo, an acolyte, bearing messages from Pope Zosimus. See *Ep.* 104. In the Christological conflict, Cyril of Alexandria received help from Pope Celestine's deacon Leo who in turn asked John Cassian to prepare a treatise (*De incarnatione*). Prosper of Aquitaine indicated Leo's intervention was essential in convincing Pope Sixtus III to refrain from reinstating the

was the first pope who received the designation “the Great,” and the Roman Catholic Church considers him as one of the thirty-six doctors of the church. His significance is seen particularly in the rationale he provided for the supremacy of the bishop of Rome over all Christianity. Prior to Leo’s episcopate several developments had already taken place that shaped the theological and ecclesiastical views of the bishops and people at Rome and in the *catholic* churches.<sup>2</sup> However, during his episcopate (A.D. 440-461) Leo the Great distinguished himself by providing at least four additional arguments for the authority of the Roman bishop. The present article will explore Leo’s sermons and letters in order to outline his teachings on the presence of the Apostle Peter in his successors, his mediatorship of all ecclesiastical authority, the supremacy of Rome above all Christian churches, and the power of Peter and his successor the bishop of Rome to rule the universal Christian church, and to determine how they relate to previous views.<sup>3</sup>

### *The Presence of Peter in His Successors*

While the Apostle Peter had a special significance for the churches in the city of Rome, in the early centuries, he did not yet have the unique position he would assume in later centuries. The following paragraphs demonstrate that Leo the Great built on an existing tradition, yet he tried to establish the unique authority of the see of the Roman bishops by substantiating the presence of Peter in his successors by means of Scripture and legal concepts.

---

Pelagian bishop Julian of Eclanum. Just before his election as pope, Leo was on a mission to intermediate between the Roman general Aetius and the praetorian prefect Albinus. See McShane, “Leo I (440-61),” 51, 52.

<sup>2</sup>Scholars have investigated the theological developments regarding the issue of authority during the first three centuries, yet they usually follow different hermeneutical approaches and aim at diverse agendas often based on their denominational setting. See Hans Freiherr von Campenhausen, *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1953); Francis A. Sullivan, *From Apostles to Bishops: The Development of the Episcopacy in the Early Church* (New York: Newman, 2001).

<sup>3</sup>Besides Leo’s famous *Tome*, written in A.D. 449, there are extant 143 letters and 96 sermons. Most of his sermons follow the classical format of *keerygma*, *didache*, and *parenesis*. While he frequently mentioned Peter in his sermons, his references are rather incidental in character and usually located in a liturgical setting. Occasions for these sermons were, e.g., anniversaries of Leo’s consecration as pope, sermons about fasting and giving alms, the celebration of the vigils, and Christmas. See Tad W. Guzie, “Word and Worship in the Preaching of Saint Leo the Great: A Dissertation” (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1970), 21, 22; Edward P. Pepka, “The Theology of St. Peter’s Presence in His Successors According to St. Leo the Great” (Ph.D. Dissertation, The Catholic University of America, 1986), 90, 93.

Until the late second century A.D. Christian literature mentioned both Peter and Paul as founders and organizers of the church at Rome.<sup>4</sup> Afterwards the focus and emphasis shifted however towards Peter. Thus Tertullian of Carthage (A.D. 150-230) mentioned that some “apostolic churches” possessed registers of episcopal succession and the Roman church had records proving that Clement had been ordained by Peter to be his successor as bishop of Rome.<sup>5</sup> Later writers argued that the church owed Peter special honor as he had been the founder of both the congregations and the episcopal succession of Rome.<sup>6</sup> Even two commemorative days were eventually celebrated in his honor.<sup>7</sup>

Leo the Great used the passage in Matt 16:16-19 as *locus classicus* for his reasoning that Peter and his successors received a divinely instituted office and priesthood.<sup>8</sup> Although he viewed Christ as the ultimate and “impregnable rock,” he regarded Peter as the rock whose stability and firmness was poured out into his successors.<sup>9</sup> He reasoned that Peter could not have known all by himself the things he confessed about Christ for they went beyond what human minds or eyes could perceive. Leo therefore concluded it was the Father in Heaven who had

<sup>4</sup>Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.3.2–3; Hegesippus as quoted in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4.22.1–3. The list of Hegesippus was completely preserved by Epiphanius of Salamis who lived in the fourth century A.D. See Epiphanius, *Pan.* 27.6. Eusebius still cited these lists in the first half of the fourth century. See e.g. *Hist. eccl.* 5.6.1–5; 3.2, 13, 15, 34; 4.1, 4. Further information can be found in Burnett Hillman Streeter, *The Primitive Church: Studied with Special Reference to the Origins of the Christian Ministry* (London: Macmillan, 1929), 290–295; Joseph Barber Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers: Part 1: S. Clement of Rome* (London: Macmillan, 1890), 208, 209, 326–333; and Kenneth A. Strand, “Peter and Paul in Relationship to the Episcopal Succession in the Church at Rome,” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 30, no. 3 (1992): 219–222.

<sup>5</sup>Tertullian, *Praescr.* 32; cf. Strand, “Peter and Paul,” 222; Roberts, Alexander, and James Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325* (1885; reprint, Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1989), 3:258.

<sup>6</sup>See Optatus, *De schism. Donat.*, 2.3; Augustine, *Epist.* 53, *ad Generosum*, par. 2; cf. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 171–174; Strand, “Peter and Paul,” 222, 223. “The cult of Peter had already far surpassed all other cults in Rome.” See Bernhard Schimmelpfennig, *The Papacy*, transl. James Sievert (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992), 25. Cyprian of Carthage was very clear on Peter’s supremacy. See Adrian Fortescue, *The Early Papacy: to the Synod of Chalcedon in 451*, ed. Scott M. P. Reid, 3rd ed. (Southampton: Saint Austin Press, 1997), 45–47.

<sup>7</sup>June 29 was celebrated as the day of his death, and February 22 as the anniversary of his taking of the office as the first bishop of Rome (the festival of the *cathedra petri*).

<sup>8</sup>*Serm.* 3.2, 3.3.

<sup>9</sup>*Serm.* 24.6, 5.4. See also Myron Wojtowytch, *Papsttum und Konzile von den Anfängen bis zu Leo I. (440–461): Studien zur Entstehung der Überordnung des Papstes über Konzile*, ed. Georg Denzler, *Päpste und Papsttum*, vol. 17 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1981), 304.



revealed these things to the Apostle Peter.<sup>10</sup> That incident had far-reaching consequences for the church because it gave Peter absolute authority.

[Peter had] received the fullness of blessing, and was endued with the holy firmness of the inviolable Rock on which the Church should be built and conquer the gates of hell and the laws of death, so that, in loosing or binding the petitions of any whatsoever, only that should be ratified in heaven which had been settled by the judgment of Peter.<sup>11</sup>

Leo described the foundational role of the Apostle Peter in a number of ways. Thus he interpreted Jesus' statements in Matt 16:16-19 and 18:18 as an ordination of Peter before the other apostles "in such a way that from his being called the Rock, from his being pronounced the Foundation, from his being constituted the Doorkeeper of the kingdom of heaven, from his being set as the Umpire to bind and to loose, whose judgments shall retain their validity in heaven."<sup>12</sup> In his view, the universal church was founded "on the very citadel of the Apostolic Rock."<sup>13</sup> The solidity of Peter's faith was perpetual and on him was reared the entire structure of the church. Leo argued that as Peter's faith in Christ remained continually so what Christ instituted in Peter remained too, revealing the latter as "the chief of the apostles" who does not cease to operate.<sup>14</sup>

He believed the Apostle Peter was still active and continued to perform faithfully the work entrusted to him by Christ.<sup>15</sup> Peter's "power lives," and his "authority prevails in his See."<sup>16</sup> Moreover, Peter was "not only the patron of this [Roman] see, but also the primate of all bishops" in the entire world.<sup>17</sup> Leo thought he gave only Peter's warning and preached nothing else than his teaching.<sup>18</sup> He repeatedly expressed his belief in the support and presence of Peter in the church.<sup>19</sup>

The affirmation of Peter's active presence in his successors had significant practical consequences for regular believers. Leo considered himself not merely the heir "of so great a shepherd" as the Apostle Peter but viewed himself actually

<sup>10</sup>*Serm.* 51.1.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup>*Serm.* 3.3.

<sup>13</sup>*Serm.* 3.4.

<sup>14</sup>*Serm.* 3.2.

<sup>15</sup>*Serm.* 3.3, 5.4, 12.4, 16.6, 17.4, 18.3. See also Wojtowysch, *Papsttum und Konzile von den Anfängen bis zu Leo I. (440-461)*, 305.

<sup>16</sup>*Serm.* 3.3.

<sup>17</sup>*Serm.* 3.4, 4.4. See also Wojtowysch, *Papsttum und Konzile von den Anfängen bis zu Leo I. (440-461)*, 304.

<sup>18</sup>*Serm.* 3.4.

<sup>19</sup>*Serm.* 2.2.

as “a Peter” so that the believers would accept St. Peter in his unworthy successor Leo. Viewing himself as standing “at the helm of the Church” for the purpose of building it up, Leo was glad the believers showed loyalty, well-ordered love, and affection to him as Peter’s successor since Christ himself established the episcopal institution.<sup>20</sup> When they celebrated the anniversary of Leo’s consecration as pope, they, in his view, actually “met together” in Peter’s honor.<sup>21</sup> Leo assigned the individual sitting on the see of the bishop of Rome even direct inspiration by Peter.<sup>22</sup>

Further, he employed legal terminology to consolidate the connection between the Roman bishops and the Apostle Peter. Thus, he argued, they were *consortibus honoris sui* (partakers of his [Peter’s] honor) as Peter’s *indignatis* (honor) is not absent in his *indigno haeredis* (unworthy heir).<sup>23</sup> Several scholars note that *consortium* (partaker) and *haeres* (heir) form a close legal connection between the pope and Peter as these terms have to be understood in the context of Roman law.<sup>24</sup> The heir entered into the rights and responsibilities of the ancestor for the latter to survive as a legal person. The heir and the testator were identical insofar that only the physical bearer of the legal title changed. Hence Leo seemed to suggest the pope obtained all rights and powers of the Apostle Peter, although his successor would always remain unworthy of the office which as an institution was strongly exalted beyond its individual owner.<sup>25</sup> By referring to himself as Peter’s *vice fungimur* (substitute), Leo created another legal conception of the connection between Peter and his successors.<sup>26</sup> It should nevertheless be noted that he did not originate that idea because the Roman legate Philipp suggested already at the Council of Ephesus in A. D. 431 that Peter was living and judging in his successors.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>20</sup>Ibid.

<sup>21</sup>*Serm.* 2.2, 3.4. See also Wojtowytch, *Papsttum und Konzile von den Anfängen bis zu Leo I. (440-461)*, 304.

<sup>22</sup>*Ep.* 10.9.

<sup>23</sup>*Serm.* 2.2, 3.4.

<sup>24</sup>Kurt-Dietrich Schmidt, “Papa Petrus ipse,” *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 54 (1935): 273, 274; Walter Ullmann, “Leo I and the Theme of Papal Primacy,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 11 (1960): 25-51. Michele Maccarone, “La dottrina del primato papale dal IV all’VIII secolo nelle relazioni con le chiese occidentali,” in *Le chiese nei regni dell’ Europa occidentale e i loro rapporti con Roma sino all’ 800*, Settimane di studio del Centro Italiano di studi sull’ alto medioevo VII (Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1960), 2:670-675, shows the additional connection between the terms *successor* and *haeres*.

<sup>25</sup>Wojtowytch, *Papsttum und Konzile von den Anfängen bis zu Leo I. (440-461)*, 305.

<sup>26</sup>*Serm.* 3.4.

<sup>27</sup>Ullmann, “Leo I and the Theme of Papal Primacy,” 34; Maccarone, “La dottrina del primato papale dal IV all’VIII secolo nelle relazioni con le chiese occidentali,” 678-685;

The tendency to concentrate all ecclesiastical power upon Peter reached a culmination in Leo's rhetoric. His interpretation of the above passages from the Gospel of Matthew are foundational for this rhetoric. The following quotation is exemplary for his argument.

"And I," he said, "tell you," that is to say, just as my Father has manifested my divinity to you, so I make known to you your own prominence. "That you are Peter," that is to say, although I am the indestructible rock, I "the cornerstone who make both things one," I "the foundation on which no one can lay another," you also are rock because you are made firm in my strength. What belongs properly to my own power you share with me by participation.<sup>28</sup>

The same argument is repeated by Leo in another place, "He [Jesus] wished him [Peter] who had been received into partnership in His undivided unity to be named what He Himself was, when He said: 'Thou art Peter . . .'"<sup>29</sup> Wojtowysch observes that Leo's view of Christ sharing his divine power with the "first of the apostles" was new and stressed that there was no equality among the twelve.<sup>30</sup> Further, Leo suggested that as Peter "unfailingly maintains that fellowship which he has with the eternal Priest [Christ]," he was substantially distinguished from the other apostles and bishops because he was in a position similar or equal to Christ.<sup>31</sup>

### *Peter as Mediator of all Ecclesiastical Authority*

The second point repeatedly promoted in various ways by Leo were the ideas that God shared his power with Peter and it was only through this apostolic mediator that others could receive authority from God.<sup>32</sup> As a result, Peter was in every way the mediator between Christ and the apostles because no power was directly bestowed by the Lord apart from the one given through Peter's hands. In interpreting Luke 22:31, 32, Leo expressed the same thought in a different way.

---

Wojtowysch, *Papsttum und Konzile von den Anfängen bis zu Leo I. (440-461)*, 305, 306; Adrian Fortescue, *The Early Papacy: to the Synod of Chalcedon in 451*, edited by Scott M. P. Reid, 3rd ed. (Southampton: Saint Austin Press, 1997), 50.

<sup>28</sup>*Serm.* 4.2; Leo the Great, *St. Leo the Great: Sermons*, transl. Jane Patricia Freeland and Agnes Josephine Conway, The Fathers of the Church, vol. 93 (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1996), 27.

<sup>29</sup>*Ep.* 10.1.

<sup>30</sup>Wojtowysch, *Papsttum und Konzile von den Anfängen bis zu Leo I. (440-461)*, 306.

<sup>31</sup>*Serm.* 5.5.

<sup>32</sup>*Serm.* 4.2. See also Hans Martin Klinkenberg, "Papsttum und Reichskirche bei Leo dem Großen," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonistische Abteilung* 38 (1952): 42-44.

Each apostle encountered the same danger through temptation from fear. All equally needed the help of divine protection, since the devil wanted to harass them all and to crush them all. Still, the Lord took special care of Peter and prayed especially for Peter. It was as if the condition of the others would be more secure if the mind of their leader were not overcome. In Peter, therefore, the fortitude of all is reinforced, for the aid of divine grace is ordered in such a way that the firmness given to Peter through Christ is conferred upon the apostles through Peter.<sup>33</sup>

Since Peter alone was the mainstay of the church's faith, the idea of a plurality of equally original traditions of truth was well-nigh impossible. The true faith could therefore be found only in one tradition. By definition every other tradition had to draw its purity and genuineness from his tradition. Peter was literally the rock on whom everything was built, and on his stability everything depended. Leo viewed Peter as the exclusive center of all ecclesiastical power. Other competitive authorities were evidently impossible and totally excluded. This reasoning provided the rationale for his claim that the gospel commission reached the apostles only through Peter.<sup>34</sup>

According to God's will, the proclamation of the truth for the salvation of all men was supposed to be the concern of all apostles. Hence, Leo stated, "He has placed the principal charge on the blessed Peter, chief of all the Apostles: and from him as from the Head wishes His gifts to flow to all the body: so that anyone who dares to secede from Peter's solid rock may understand that he has no part or lot in the divine mystery."<sup>35</sup> He acknowledged Matt 28:19, 20 obviously taught that Christ gave the gospel commission to all apostles, yet Leo focused more on the scene in which Christ distinguished Peter from the other apostles and honored him, interpreting everything else from that center. In fact, he concluded the gospel commission must have been issued to Peter in the first place. Leo interpreted Matt 18:18, where Christ conferred the power to bind and loose to all apostles, in a similar way from the context of Peter's supremacy.<sup>36</sup>

### *Rome's Supremacy above all Churches*

In his emphasis on the supremacy of the bishop of Rome, Leo the Great referred to another aspect—the supremacy of Rome above all churches. The idea of Rome's superiority was not a new one but in Leo's rhetoric it gained a new dimension. The present section describes the status of Rome at the beginning of the 5th century and Leo's rhetoric to utilize the city's heritage to bolster the status of its bishop.

<sup>33</sup>*Serm.* 4.3.

<sup>34</sup>Wojtowitsch, *Papsttum und Konzile von den Anfängen bis zu Leo I. (440-461)*, 307.

<sup>35</sup>*Ep.* 10.1.

<sup>36</sup>*Serm.* 4.3.

By the end of the fourth century there were five patriarchies, four of which were in the East—Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople—and one was in the West—Rome. In A.D. 325, the sixth canon of Nicaea declared Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch as the three primary sees, being one level above the metropolitans. The patriarchy of Constantinople emerged later due to the late establishment of the city, yet, in A.D. 381, the Council of Constantinople declared that it, as the “new Rome,” possessed ecclesiastical primacy based on its being the capital of the Roman Empire. The old Rome regarded that claim as a violation of the “apostolic principle,” referring to the apostolic foundation of its church and patriarchy.<sup>37</sup> Rome still occupied a supreme place in the educated imagination of its citizens even though the city itself played only a relatively unimportant part in the political and economic life of the empire. Distinguishing himself as the head of the local aristocracy especially in times of distress, the bishop of Rome had already assumed the role of the supreme municipal representative and authority of the city.<sup>38</sup> Thus, in the A.D. 430s and 440s, the Roman bishops worked in “close alliance with the recently Christianized urban aristocracy, announced their adoption of a classical tradition within the city, and together they staked out a Christian, papal area in it, well removed from the ancient civic centre, still heavy with memories of the unexorcised pagan past.”<sup>39</sup> The bishops saw the possibilities to turn the city into the head and center of the Christian world so that the ancient capital could be renewed by its two dead apostles and be re-born as a Christian Rome.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>37</sup>Ivor J. Davidson, *A Public Faith: From Constantine to the Medieval World, A.D. 312-600*, Baker History of the Church, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2005), 217, 218; Ludwig Freiherr von Hertling, *Communio: Church and Papacy in Early Christianity* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1972), 65; John Meyendorff, “Justinian, the Empire and the Church,” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 22 (1968): 49.

<sup>38</sup>R. A. Markus, *The End of Ancient Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 125, 126.

<sup>39</sup>Richard Krautheimer, “The Architecture of Sixtus III: A Fifth Century Renaissance,” in *De Artibus Opuscula XL: Essays in Honor of Erwin Panofsky*, ed. Millard Meiss (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1961), 291-302; idem, *Three Christian Capitals: Topography and Politics* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), 104-121.

<sup>40</sup>Markus, *The End of Ancient Christianity*, 126; Ernst Hartwig Kantorowicz, “Puer exoriens: On the Hypapante mosaics of S. Maria Maggiore,” in *Perennitas: Beiträge zur christlichen Archäologie und Kunst, zur Geschichte der Literatur, der Liturgie und des Mönchtums sowie zur Philosophie des Rechts und zur politischen Philosophie*, P. Thomas Michels zum 70. Geburtstag, ed. Hugo Rahner, and Emmanuel von Severus, Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchtums und des Benediktinerordens, Supplement (Münster: Aschendorff, 1963), 118-135; John M. Huskinson, *Concordia Apostolorum: Christian Propaganda at Rome in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries*, British Archaeological Reports International Series, vol. 148 (Oxford: British Archaeological Reports, 1982).

These changes of circumstances and influence created “the conditions for pope [sic] Leo to give moral and religious content to the ideology of Rome’s Christian renewal.”<sup>41</sup> It was his goal to turn Rome into a totally new Christian civic community. This becomes very clear in Leo’s *Ep.* 82.1 in which he declared the people of Rome as

holy people, an elect nation, a priestly and royal city, become, through the see of Peter established here, the head of the world; ruling more widely now through the divine religion than it ever did by worldly dominion. Though enlarged by many victories, you have spread the authority of your rule over land and sea. What your warlike labours have obtained for you is less than what the Christian peace has brought you.<sup>42</sup>

Since Leo considered the Petrine power as fundamental, he portrayed the supremacy of Rome above all churches in a new light and understood all episcopal activities as part of the exercise of Roman authority. Hence, only the Petrine-Roman activities guaranteed everything would eventually be on the right track. The following statements show the foundation of the monarchical authority of the bishop of Rome.

Every single pastor guides his flock with a special responsibility, knowing that he will have to “render an account” for the sheep entrusted to him. We, on the other hand, have a joint responsibility with all of them. No one’s ministry falls outside the scope of our work.<sup>43</sup>

Therefore, this privilege of Peter resides wherever judgment has been passed in accordance with his fairness. There cannot be too much severity or too much lenience where nothing is bound or loosed outside of that which blessed Peter has loosed or bound.<sup>44</sup>

A couple incidences illustrate the impact of that reasoning in his dealings with secular authorities. For example, Leo sent a letter to the emperor, asking him to support Proterius, the uncanonically consecrated bishop of Alexandria in A.D. 453, with the necessary military power against heretics and to “use his authority to order the appropriate readings in Alexandria, so that no one would think that Proterius had introduced anything new into orthodox theology.”<sup>45</sup> There were other instances where Leo asked the emperor to take disciplinary measures against

<sup>41</sup>Markus, *The End of Ancient Christianity*, 126.

<sup>42</sup>*Ibid.*, 126, 127.

<sup>43</sup>*Serm.* 5.2. Cf. *Ep.* 16.1. See also Wojtowysch, *Papsttum und Konzile von den Anfängen bis zu Leo I. (440-461)*, 310-318, 328-350, on Leo’s activities and influences at different synods and councils, as well as his exercise of authority and influence on the emperors, etc.

<sup>44</sup>*Serm.* 4.3. Cf. *Ep.* 1.2.

<sup>45</sup>Timothy E. Gregory, *Vox Populi: Popular Opinion and Violence in the Religious Controversies of the Fifth Century A.D.* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1979), 188.

clergy making up the bishops' neglect.<sup>46</sup> Dvornik notes that the process of the synods and meetings "gradually" changed from the way they had been outlined in the letters of Cyprian of Carthage as being held in North Africa to the structure of "the meetings of the Roman senate."<sup>47</sup> Another time, Leo expressed satisfaction at Marcian's edict and a letter of Pulcheria against some monks because the emperors showed "the sublimity of their royal greatness and their sacerdotal holiness." He even numbered Emperor Leo I among "the preachers of Christ" and exhorted him to firmly put down and repel "those who denounced the Christian name." He suggested the royal power was bestowed on him first and foremost to protect the Church, and not only to rule the world.<sup>48</sup> The bishops of Arles addressed Leo stating that "through blessed Peter, the prince of the apostles, the most holy Roman Church should hold sovereignty over all the Churches of the whole World."<sup>49</sup>

The above examples illustrate Leo's claim to absolute authority above both secular rulers and the other patriarchies although it should be noted that it was difficult to enforce that claim in every place as some ecclesiastical authorities failed to share his aspirations. A point in case is the application of the "apostolic principle" which, at least theoretically, granted the city and the patriarchy of Rome unique primacy before the other patriarchies. While it was more or less respected in the West, it is noteworthy that all other patriarchies were located in the East.

Leo and his successors insisted on the application of the so called "apostolic" principle in support of their precedence before the other sees.<sup>50</sup> Nevertheless, in A.D. 451, the twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon reaffirmed the decision of A.D. 381 that Constantinople as the "new Rome" possessed ecclesiastical primacy specifying further that its bishop "had direct jurisdiction over the major metropolitan dioceses of Pontus, Asia, and Trace, and over the churches outside the empire that were associated with them." Leo's delegates protested pointing to the decision of Nicaea. That the authority of Rome should depend upon "secular political prestige rather than upon the eminence of an apostolic foundation" was quite unacceptable to Leo. Until A.D. 453 he refused to sign the doctrinal statement of Chalcedon, protested against the twenty-eighth canon, and annulled it although Marcian had officially declared the decisions of the council to be law.

<sup>46</sup>Francis Dvornik, "Emperors, Popes, and General Councils," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 6 (1951): 17.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., 4.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., 16.

<sup>49</sup>Fortescue, *The Early Papacy*, 50.

<sup>50</sup>John Meyendorff, "Justinian, the Empire and the Church," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 22 (1968): 49.

Although Leo did not have problems with the theology of the statement, his resistance to ratify it was based on the elevation of Constantinople.<sup>51</sup>

### *The Power to Lead and Command*

The bishops of Rome in the late fourth century considered themselves the direct successors of the Apostle Peter, yet Leo the Great emphasized his control and rule over the entire Christian church as he thought that Peter had been granted absolute universal power over both the religious and the secular realm.

Pope Damasus (A.D. 366-384), for example, referred to Rome already as the *sedes apostolica* (the apostolic see), arguing the approbation of the bishop of Rome was necessary to validate or annul the decisions of the councils. Siricius (A.D. 384-399) was the first pope who issued *epistolae decretales* (decretals) to bishops outside of Italy. These epistles contained not only common advice but they included decrees claiming the same legal force as decrees of the emperor.<sup>52</sup> Innocent I (A.D. 402-417) commissioned bishops who were to be responsible for certain provinces in the name of the Roman bishop because he wanted to achieve the order and unity of the church under a Roman leadership.<sup>53</sup> When the famous John Chrysostom was dismissed from Constantinople's court, Innocent asked for his reinstatement, an effort for which Chrysostom thanked his fellow bishop.<sup>54</sup> Innocent entertained also contact with the bishop of Antioch which he would have liked to see as his vicar in the east.<sup>55</sup>

Already before Nicaea (A.D. 325), and increasingly afterwards, the procedures of ecclesiastical meetings followed the senatorial model. Besides other similarities, both popes and legates claimed the presidency and exercised the function once claimed and exercised by the *princeps senatus* of the Roman Senate.<sup>56</sup> The letters of Cyprian of Carthage describe the whole process of synods and local meetings as they were held in North Africa. It is apparent that these meetings "gradually modeled themselves according to the meetings of the Roman senate."<sup>57</sup> When

<sup>51</sup>Davidson, *A Public Faith*, 2:217, 218.

<sup>52</sup>Karen Piepenbrink, *Antike und Christentum*, Geschichte kompakt (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2007), 67.

<sup>53</sup>Gert Haendler, *Die abendländische Kirche im Zeitalter der Völkerwanderung*, 3rd ed., Kirchengeschichte in Einzeldarstellungen, vol. I/5 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlags-Anstalt, 1987), 66.

<sup>54</sup>John Chrysostom, 2 *Ep. Innoc.*

<sup>55</sup>Erich Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, Römische Kirche und Imperium Romanum, vol. 1 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1930), 322.

<sup>56</sup>Francis Dvornik, "Emperors, Popes, and General Councils," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 6 (1951): 18.

<sup>57</sup>*Ibid.*, 4.



Leo became bishop, it was already common practice for the bishop of Rome to supervise the councils and synods in the West. In the East, this function was occupied by the emperor.<sup>58</sup>

Far more explicit and distinct than his predecessors were Leo's statements regarding the claim that Peter had received the rule and control over the church in a literal sense.<sup>59</sup> He claimed that Peter alone had been chosen out of the whole world to be in charge of the universal convocation of peoples, every apostle, and all the Fathers of the Church. Although there were many priests and shepherds among God's people, it was Peter who properly rules each one who is completely ruled by Christ.<sup>60</sup>

Leo called Peter the *regimen totius ecclesiae* (guide of the whole church)<sup>61</sup> who had received the *ecclesiae gubernacula* (steering wheel of the church).<sup>62</sup> He had been appointed by Christ to be *totius ecclesiae principem* (the prince of the whole church),<sup>63</sup> using more frequently and intensely the title *principatus*, which had already been used occasionally before, to describe the position of Peter and the Roman bishop.<sup>64</sup> According to Leo, the primacy of Peter was not debatable: "Yet anyone who holds that the headship must be denied to Peter, cannot really diminish his dignity: but is puffed up with the breath of his pride, and plunges himself into the lowest depth."<sup>65</sup> It was an offence of the worst kind for someone "not to suffer himself to be subject to the blessed Apostle Peter."<sup>66</sup> For example, Leo secured an edict from the emperor Valentinian III in which the primacy over the whole occident was affirmed to the See of Peter. A violation of that claim was subject to

<sup>58</sup>Piepenbrink, *Antike und Christentum*, 67. The terms "council" and "synods" were used synonymously in the old church. Whereas today only those councils are considered significant that are generally referred to as ecumenical councils, the fourth and fifth centuries witnessed several other significant councils and synods in western cities such as in Rome (A.D. 313, 375, 382), Arles (A.D. 314, 353, 452), Carthage (A.D. 345-348, 397, 401, 411, 418), Milan (A.D. 355), Rimini (A.D. 359), Paris (A.D. 360-361), Valence (A.D. 374), Saragossa (A.D. 380), Toledo (A.D. 397-400), and Turin (A.D. 398).

<sup>59</sup>Wojtowysch, *Papsttum und Konzile von den Anfängen bis zu Leo I. (440-461)*, 308.

<sup>60</sup>*Serm.* 4.2. The Latin text states, in fact, that Peter was put before (*praeponatur*) all the Fathers of the Church.

<sup>61</sup>*Serm.* 62.2.

<sup>62</sup>*Serm.* 3.3.

<sup>63</sup>*Serm.* 4.4.

<sup>64</sup>Wojtowysch, *Papsttum und Konzile von den Anfängen bis zu Leo I. (440-461)*, 309.

<sup>65</sup>*Ep.* 10.2. Leo even stated, "In the person of my lowliness he [Peter] is seen, he is honoured, in whom remains the care of all pastors and of the sheep of their charge. His power does not fail, even in an unworthy heir." See Fortescue, *The Early Papacy*, 62.

<sup>66</sup>*Ep.* 10.2. Cf. Wojtowysch, *Papsttum und Konzile von den Anfängen bis zu Leo I. (440-461)*, 309.

legal penalties.<sup>67</sup> He asked the bishops of North African to submit to his authority.<sup>68</sup> Leo was further determined to rid the city of Rome of Manichees and other heretics as a part of a whole program of establishing Rome as a *theopolis*.<sup>69</sup>

Leo's picture of the Christian Church is summarized in a letter to his vicar in Thessalonica. When Leo heard Anatolius had been made bishop of Thessalonica, he reminded him that he was the vicar of the bishop of Rome, the successor of Peter, "on the solidity of which foundation the Church is established."<sup>70</sup>

Accordingly, the disciples were all equal in regard to their election by Christ, yet only Peter received the power to lead the rest. In Leo's view, that incident provided the model for the distinction between the bishops at the provincial, metropolitan, and universal level. Nothing should be separated from the head of the church, and everything is given to the care of "Peter's one seat."<sup>71</sup> The strictly structured building of the church had its head in the Roman church, being distinguished from the others by its "distinction of power." Unity existed therefore only if everyone carried his subjection willfully and if nothing departed from the will of the Roman "head." Harmony was thus inseparably connected with the willingness to obey especially the successor of the apostle Peter.<sup>72</sup>

He suggested that no congregation or union of churches was allowed to rest upon their own authority apart from the successor of Peter. Even the great episcopacies of the East were nothing else than intermediaries that owed loyalty and obedience to the See of Peter.<sup>73</sup> Thus when the Syrian theologian and bishop Theodoret was excommunicated at the *Latrocinium* in A.D. 449, Leo decided he should be restored to his see and be admitted as one of the accusers of Dioscorus at Chalcedon resulting in an uproar at the council.<sup>74</sup> He wanted to enforce his

<sup>67</sup>"*Tunc enim demum ecclesiarum pax ubique servabitur, si rectorem sum agnoscat universitas [ecclesiarum].*" See *Novellae Valent.* 3. tit. 16; Karl Heussi, *Kompendium der Kirchengeschichte*, 16th ed. (1971; reprint, Tübingen: Mohr, 1981), 126; cf. Davidson, *A Public Faith*, 2:321.

<sup>68</sup>Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church: Nicene and Post-Nicene Christianity (A.D. 311-600)*, 8th ed. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914), 3:320.

<sup>69</sup>R. A. Markus, *The End of Ancient Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 127; C. Lepelley, "Saint Léon le Grand et la cité romaine," *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 35 (1962): 137, 147.

<sup>70</sup>*Ep.* 6; cf. Joseph McCabe, *Crisis in the History of the Papacy: A Study of Twenty Famous Popes Whose Careers and Whose Influence Were Important in the Development of the Church and in the History of the World* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1916), 41.

<sup>71</sup>*Ep.* 14.12.

<sup>72</sup>Wojtowitsch, *Papsttum und Konzile von den Anfängen bis zu Leo I. (440-461)*, 309.

<sup>73</sup>Erich Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, Römische Kirche und Imperium Romanum, vol. 1 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1930), 457.

<sup>74</sup>Patrick T. R. Gray, *The Defense of Chalcedon in the East (451-553)*, ed. Heiko A. Oberman, *Studies in the History of Christian Thought*, vol. 20 (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 8.

claim as the head of the Church even in the “new” Rome. He “kept up a continuous correspondence with a wide range of people in the capital” trying to influence them.<sup>75</sup> For example, in December 449, he wrote “to the citizens of Constantinople” congratulating them for maintaining the true faith and resisting heresy. When Anatolius as the new bishop of Constantinople took up correspondence with Leo the latter expressed his surprise to Constantinople’s orthodox archimandrites and clerics about the new bishop’s lack of candor. Afterwards, Leo sent a delegation “armed with a collection of appropriate texts from the Fathers” to correct all those who had been led astray. In late A.D. 450 the new empress Pulcheria informed Leo that Anatolius had eventually accepted Leo’s theology and agreed to sign his *Tome*.<sup>76</sup> Since the Constantinopolitan patriarch was apparently too negligent, Leo asked the emperor in A.D. 457 to “administer to the Church [of Constantinople] even the remedy of removing such men [clerics favorable to heretical tenets] not only from the clerical ranks but from the territory of the city, lest the holy people of God be further infected by the contagion of their perversion.”<sup>77</sup> In his view, the conception of the church as being based on his doctrine of Peter left no room for autonomous councils because matters of faith and jurisdiction led necessarily and without exception into the *cathedra Petri*.<sup>78</sup>

### *Conclusion*

This article was intended to show new arguments employed by Leo the Great for the authority of the bishop of Rome. Leo built on existing traditions concerning the role of the Apostle Peter as the founder of Rome’s churches and its episcopal succession, the significance of the bishop of Rome by standing in Peter’s succession, and the Western perception of the significance of the city and the patriarchy of Rome based on the “apostolic principle.” It has been shown that Leo emphasized the presence of the Apostle Peter in his successors, Peter’s mediatorship of all ecclesiastical authority, the supremacy of Rome above all Christian churches, and the power of Peter and his successor, the bishop of Rome, to rule the universal Christian church.

First, beginning with Matt 16:16-19, Leo asserted that Peter was the rock and the church was continually reared on Peter’s confession of faith. He argued that through this event Peter had been ordained before the other apostles. Now he was still active and present in the church, being present in his successor and speaking through him. In addition, Leo employed legal terminology to strengthen

<sup>75</sup>*Ep.* 50; *Ep.* 51; Gregory, *Vox Populi*, 151.

<sup>76</sup>Gregory, *Vox Populi*, 151, 163, 167.

<sup>77</sup>Dvornik, “Emperors, Popes, and General Councils,” 16, 17.

<sup>78</sup>Klinkenberg, “Papsttum und Reichskirche bei Leo dem Großen,” 53.

the continuity between Peter and the Roman bishops, to finally affirm that all ecclesiastical power concentrated on him.

Second, Leo emphasized that Peter was the only mediator between Christ and his apostles because Christ had set apart Peter as the mediator of the genuine tradition and of the locus of ecclesiastical power. Likewise, the bishop of Rome as Peter's successor was the source of the true tradition and the foundation for all authority in the church on earth.

Third, in his view, only the Petrine-Roman activities guaranteed that the church would proceed in the right direction. Thus ecclesiastical and imperial ideas converged to form the monarchical foundation of the role and work of the bishop of Rome. While Leo attempted to enforce that authority in all ecclesial and secular matters, his attempts occasionally met resistance as his view of the episcopal power of Peter's successor was not always shared by all bishops or secular rulers, specifically not in the East.

Fourth, while Leo's predecessors considered themselves as Peter's successors who were granted unique authority, he emphasized far more explicitly Peter's absolute rule and control over the universal church. He was the supreme ruler whose authority was not to be questioned. Although all disciples were equally chosen by Christ, only Peter had received the power to lead the rest and became the sole foundation for the worldwide church. Leo stressed that as this incident provided the model for all later ecclesiastical hierarchy, ecclesiastical unity could only come to pass when everyone yielded completely to the will of the bishop of Rome.

This study underlines the significant additions the views of Leo the Great made to the rationale of previous bishops and church leaders regarding the power and authority of the Roman bishop. While he provided the rationale for the absolute and complete universal rule of the Roman episcopacy, it was not until later centuries that this authority could really be enforced by the Papacy.

Future studies could explore the continuity or discontinuity of Leo's rationale in later and present Roman Catholic theology and to what extent they influenced and shaped medieval papal claims to power and their enforcements in both the religious and secular realms.

# ANDREWS UNIVERSITY SEMINARY STUDENT JOURNAL

The Journal of the Doctoral Student Club  
of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary of Andrews University  
4145 East Campus Circle Drive, Berrien Springs, Michigan 49104-1550, U.S.A.

*Editor:* Adriani M. Rodrigues  
*Associate Editor:* Denis Kaiser  
*Managing Editor:* Jerome Skinner  
*Associate Managing Editor:* Arlyn S. Drew

*Executive Board:* Jiri Moskala, Dean of the Seminary; Christon Arthur, Dean of the School of Graduate Studies & Research; Tom Shepherd, Director of the PhD in Religion and ThD Programs; Flavio Prestes Neto, President of the Doctoral Student Club; Adriani M. Rodrigues, Editor of AUSSJ; John W. Reeve, Editor of AUSS; Jo Ann Davidson; Roy Gane; Wagner Kuhn; Terry Robertson.

*Communications:* E-Mail: [adriani@andrews.edu](mailto:adriani@andrews.edu)  
Web: <http://www.andrews.edu/openjournal>

The *Andrews University Seminary Student Journal (AUSSJ)*, established in 2014, is an online, open access, multi-disciplinary, peer-reviewed journal that is led, edited, and reviewed by a team of doctoral students and faculty members of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary at Andrews University. The purpose of the journal is to disseminate scholarly contributions of graduate students. Submissions may be made in the area of Systematic Theology, Philosophy, Ethics, Hebrew Bible, Jewish Studies, New Testament, Archaeology and Ancient Near Eastern Studies, Church History, Applied Theology, Mission, and Religious Education.

The opinions expressed in articles, book reviews, etc., are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the editors or of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary.

---

## GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS AND REVIEWERS

*AUSSJ* publishes research articles and brief notes on the following topics: Systematic Theology, Philosophy, Ethics, Hebrew Bible, Jewish Studies, New Testament, Archaeology and Ancient Near Eastern Studies, Church History, Applied Theology, Mission, and Religious Education.

The focus of the journal, as that of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, where *AUSSJ* is based, is biblical. A high regard for Scripture, along with elevated standards of research, characterizes the choice of articles. *AUSSJ* accepts articles written by authors of different faith persuasions, as long as this focus is taken into account.

*AUSSJ* is a refereed journal. Thus each article is read by two scholars who are competent in the area treated in the article. *AUSSJ* editors refer helpful referee comments to the author to facilitate the process of any necessary rewriting. After revising the manuscript, the author may resubmit the article. Revised manuscripts should be accompanied by a cover letter detailing the changes requested and the action taken (or the author's argument for retaining the original text). To maintain objectivity, the author's name is deleted from the manuscript copies sent to the referee, and the referees' names are deleted from any comments furnished to the author. A final decision on whether or not the article will be published in *AUSSJ* is made by the editors.

*AUSSJ* accepts articles written in English. Articles submitted to *AUSSJ* must conform to acceptable English language standards. American spelling and punctuation will be used in editing. Authors are asked to use inclusive gender language, such as "humanity" rather than "mankind," "person" or "human being" rather than "man."

For general style matters, *AUSSJ* uses Kate L. Turabian, *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*, 7th ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), and subsequent editions. Scholarly abbreviations and biblical issues not covered in Turabian follow *The SBL Handbook of Style for Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (Patrick H. Alexander et al [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999]). For spelling, authors may refer to *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged* (Springfield, MA: G. and C. Merriam, 1986).

*AUSSJ* prefers articles of 10-25 pages, including footnotes. The main text is to be double-spaced (single space for footnotes and indented quotations). Longer articles may occasionally be accepted, if they are particularly significant and space is available in the journal (it is recommended that authors query the editor for such articles). When the editors deem that an article needs to be substantially shortened, they will return the manuscript to the author with instructions regarding the areas needing attention.

*AUSSJ* reserves the right to make necessary modifications to articles that have been submitted in order to comply with the journal's content and style. Authors of articles edited for publication will receive a set of first page proofs. Authors will carefully review the article, compare it to the original draft, note any corrections on the manuscript, and provide a cover letter detailing the changes and corrections made. *AUSSJ* asks that articles be reviewed in a prompt and timely manner.

Articles may be submitted through the *AUSSJ* website or alternatively by email (see the editor's email). *AUSSJ* will accept articles prepared in Microsoft Word.

Manuscripts should be double-spaced (single space for footnotes and indented quotations), have one-inch margins, and be left-justified. Excessive formatting should be avoided, with only block quotations, tables, figures, headings, and subheadings included. Tabs, rather than single spacing or first-line indentation should be used. Tables should be formed using standardized table templates provided in the author's word-processing software. The motto for formatting is, Keep it simple!

Quotations longer than five lines are to be indented and double-spaced. Spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and abbreviations must be reproduced exactly as in the original and care should be taken to preserve the original author's intent.

All biblical, classical, and patristic literature, Dead Sea Scrolls and related texts, Targumic material, Mishnaic and Rabbinic literature, Nag Hammadi Tractates, and journals, periodicals, and major reference works should follow the *SBL Handbook of Style* 8.2–8.4. For biblical references, no period is used following the abbreviations; a colon is used between chapter and verse. Biblical references should be placed in parentheses in the text of the article, rather than in footnotes (see *SBL Handbook of Style*). Citations of classical and patristic literature should follow the *SBL Handbook of Style*. The following abbreviations should be used in parenthetical or footnote references. The terms should be spelled out when they occur in the text.

Abbreviation

chap(s).	chapter(s)
col(s).	column(s)
frg(s).	fragment(s)
n(n).	note(s)
pl(s).	plate(s)
v(v).	verse(s)

See *SBL Handbook of Style* 7.1–7.4. Page numbers included in footnotes should be all-inclusive, e.g., 110-111, 234-239 rather than 110-11 or 234-39. When a note of comment includes a bibliographic reference, this reference should be set in parentheses at the end of the comment. For instance: “But C. C. Torrey thinks that the name Cyrus has been interpolated in Isa 45:1” (“The Messiah Son of Ephraim,” *JBL* [1947]: 253).

Greek and Hebrew fonts are generally preferred rather than transliteration. Transliteration should be used primarily for ancient nonbiblical languages. Due to the problem of font compatibility, *AUSSJ* accepts only BibleWorks or SBL fonts. SBL provides free downloadable fonts at its website: <http://www.sbl-site.org/e-resources.html>. BibleWorks may be purchased from <http://www.bibleworks.com>. Before submitting Greek and Hebrew in other fonts or transliteration, please query the editor for directions.